

- THE
QUARTERLY
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

Vol. IV.--No. 4.

DECEMBER, 1832.

ART. I.—ON RELIGIOUS JOY.

DIFFERENT ages of the church have been marked by a different cast of religious feeling. At some periods, christians have been more active and more joyful in the service of Christ; at other periods they have been led to retire more within themselves, and a gloomier cast of piety has generally prevailed. Every great revival of religion, however, has been an era of light and joy among the followers of Christ, not only increasing the piety of the church, but imparting to it a brighter and more animated aspect. Such was the fact, at the first outpouring of the Spirit in the days of the apostles, at the period of the reformation, and in the days of Edwards and Whitfield; and such, to a considerable extent, is the case at the present time. During the intervals between these periods of light and joy, the piety of the church has worn a less animated and happy aspect. This was particularly the case during the middle ages, when, from the force of peculiar circumstances, the remaining piety of the times assumed a gloomy, ascetic and rigorous character. That character wore off again as true religion revived, and the contemplative piety of the monastery and the cell, gave place to the more active and benevolent spirit of the gospel. In our day, so happily characterized by revivals, and by the various movements of christian benevolence, the people of God are beginning to exhibit a more cheerful cast of piety. In this respect, however, there is room for great improvement, and we are convinced that a purer and more elevated joy will yet diffuse itself through the bosom of the church, as the vital influence of the gospel shall be more and more felt. We have, therefore, thought proper to devote a few pages to this subject, and shall endeavor to show, *that the spirit of true religion is, pre-eminently, a joyful*

spirit,—explain the nature of christian joy,—advert to some of the causes which go to hinder the joy of christians,—and suggest some reasons why christians should cultivate more of this happy spirit.

I. The spirit of true religion is essentially a spirit of pure and elevated joy.

On this part of the subject we should think it unnecessary to dwell, were it not that most worldly persons, and many even among the children of God, associate an idea of gloom with the solemnities of religion. The fact, indeed, unhappily is, that few christians live in such a manner, as to exhibit in their lives the true character and tendency of the gospel. To discover that tendency, however, we have only to advert to some of those *objects* which christianity sets before us. The most prominent of these objects is *the true and living God*. It brings out to view this great and good being, as he is no where else to be seen. It exhibits him to us in the fulness and harmony, the grandeur and loveliness of his attributes. Now to a heart prepared to love this pure and exalted being, what a source of delight must it be to know that such a being exists; to feel a sweet, settled complacency in his character; and to hold communion with him. What a sublime and holy pleasure is there in contemplating his perfections; in referring all events to his superintending providence; in confiding the interests of our souls, and the interests of the universe, to his hands; in doing his will; in living for his glory. Think of this mighty being; the unity of his nature; his boundless power; his immeasurable knowledge; his eternity, unchangeableness, independence and self-existence; his being the Maker, Lord, and Judge of the universe. And then think that this glorious being, tokens of whose presence and agency are all around you, is possessed of the most perfect *moral rectitude*; that he is a good being, that this is the sum of his moral character, the true beauty and glory of the divine mind. Think of such a being, we say, and behold him governed unceasingly and forever by infinite unerring rectitude, always doing what is right and good, with all his power and all his knowledge. Now we ask, can there be to the mind of a rational being a purer satisfaction, a sublimer joy, a sweeter or more unbounded blessedness, than is to be found in loving, serving and enjoying such excellence? Is not the spirit of piety, fixed as it is on the true and living God as an object of its contemplations, affections and obedience, pre-eminently a joyful, happy spirit?

What too is that state of mind which is the proper result of believing views of Christ and his mediatorial work,—what but a happy state? Here we behold the great “mystery” of grace into which the angels desire to look: the true and living God comes down to

men ; He that was in the beginning with God, and was God, assumes our nature, is manifested in the flesh, and takes on him the form of a servant, is made under the law, bears our sins in his own body on the tree, makes atonement, dies, revives, rises, ascends to heaven, and there at the right hand of the Majesty on high ever lives to make intercession for all that come to God by him. Now is there any thing in this view of the Redeemer and his work, which is not adapted to inspire the christian with elevated and lively joy ?

Again ; in true religion *benevolence* is an essential, constituent principle. The christian spirit is always and characteristically a spirit of love. It desires and seeks the good of mankind. To do good, to promote human happiness, to save souls, is to be like Christ—is to possess his spirit. Now is not this, in its own nature, a happy spirit ? Can a person be truly benevolent ; sincerely love the souls of men ; truly seek to do good and promote human happiness ; faithfully obey Christ and possess his spirit and be like him ; and still, as the *proper* result of his benevolent, Christ-like spirit, be unhappy, or have little, very little peace and joy ? Impossible. It is only and forever the *tendency* of true christian benevolence, in every way in which it can operate, to inspire its possessor with serene enjoyment. What is so full of peace as the inward, heartfelt consciousness of seeking to do good, after the example and in obedience to the will of Christ ? When, christian reader, do you ever feel so pure, so sweet a repose stealing over your spirit and hushing all its cares and sorrows to rest, as when you can lay your head on your pillow at night, and reflect, This day through the favor of God, I have been enabled to do something to lighten the load of human suffering and to augment the sum of human happiness ;—to-day I have warned the wicked of his way and entreated him to flee from the wrath to come ; and I hope that, through divine grace, I have not entreated and warned in vain. Where is there a peace and a joy to be found on earth like that which flows in upon the good man's soul, from such reminiscences of the past as these ? But are not these the proper reminiscences of piety ? Are not these the communings which every christian should be able to hold with his own heart in his bed, in taking a review of the events of each successive day ?

Again ; in true religion there are the hopes and joys of *pardoned sin*. To a sinful, guilty being, the consciousness of unrenounced, and therefore unforgiven sin, may and sometimes does become a source of the deepest anguish. There is the pain arising from inward perceptions of blameworthiness ; the pain of self-accusation, self-upbraiding, and self-contempt ; the pain of remorseful feelings ; the pain of apprehension and fore-

boding for the future ; the pain, in short, of looking upon the great and holy God as an enemy and a "swift witness" against us for all our sins. If these feelings do not come in this world, they certainly will in another ; and they do often visit the soul with their scorpion stings here on earth. Now in true religion there is the hope of forgiveness, the sweet, sustaining, animating hope that all our sins are blotted out, and this hope is founded on no vague or idle wishes, but in the consciousness,—itself a well-spring of joy to the soul,—that sin, as a governing principle within us, is renounced and forsaken forever !

If, then, there is a single child of God among our readers, to whom the religion of the gospel is not an habitual source of pure and elevated joy, let him know and feel, that he is *perverting* the best gift of God to man ; that he is not only robbing his own soul of that growth in grace which is the natural consequence of religious joy, but putting a stumbling-block in the way of others, over which multitudes may fall to their eternal ruin.

II. Perhaps there is some danger of misapprehending the true *nature* of christian joy. It may therefore be proper briefly to examine this part of the subject. On this point too much caution can scarcely be employed. The following things here deserve attention.

1. The means of human happiness are numerous ; and many of the christian's enjoyments are derived from sources which he possesses *in common with other men*. In other words, the christian has the same natural *susceptibilities* of enjoyment with other men, and is placed under the same general *advantages* for their gratification. Thus the animal appetences, the social feelings, the desire of the good opinion of others, the susceptibility of pleasure from the gratification of taste, of imagination, of the inventive powers, of the love of novelty, of hope, etc. are the same in him as in others. In these and various other respects, there is a happiness, which is not peculiar to the child of God, but may be experienced by him in common with many who are not christians, because the sources from which it springs consist in the capacities of our nature as human beings and not merely as the children of God.

2. The *peculiar* happiness of the christian, may be greatly affected by those sources of enjoyment which are not confined to himself, but which he holds in common with other men. Thus his joy in God ; in the Redeemer ; in the good of mankind ; in his own hopes of forgiveness ; in doing the will of his Father in heaven ; in looking forward to a happy eternity before him, etc. ; may blend itself with the joy which he derives from other and more ordinary sources ; may run into all his innocent pleasures arising from the most common gratifications of life, giving to them

all somewhat of its own pure and holy sweetness, and receiving from them in turn no unimportant modifications. Thus for example, God has given us a natural relish for food ; we could not subsist without it, and its gratification, within proper limits, affords an innocent pleasure ; but how greatly is that pleasure enhanced, and rendered rational and dignified, when, in receiving "our daily bread," we can mingle, with the common gratification, the peculiar christian satisfaction of reflecting that it is a gift of God, and can present him our tribute of gratitude for it accordingly ? God has endowed us with the social principle, and no small portion of our happiness depends upon it. What a solitude would this world be, with all its busy multitudes, without this principle to bind these multitudes together in the ties of a common sympathy, and in the innumerable enjoyments which result from these ties ! The book which you have read with so much delight, would lose half its interest, if you had no one to whom you could tell how delighted you had been in reading it, and to whose heart you could hope to transfer some portion of the delightful impression, which its beauties had made on your own. The prospect, which looks so pleasant from your window, or in your walks abroad, would become comparatively dull or insipid, though rich in all the finest scenery of the summer landscape, if there was in your heart no place for the feeling, that other eyes and other hearts besides your own could see and enjoy it too. Thus it is in every case, in which we derive satisfaction from the ordinary sources of enjoyment which God has scattered so thickly around us. These sources are not closed against us when we become christians. And so far as the pleasure which they furnish is innocent and proper, religion acknowledges them all, and appropriates them to her use. The consequence is, that the happiness of the christian blends itself with all the innocent joys of this life, and is materially modified and augmented by that circumstance.

3. In true christian joy there is not necessarily *any excitement* of the mind. Great peace and comfort in religion are quite consistent with a calm, unruffled state of feeling. The mind may indeed, and occasionally does, feel the power of religious considerations so strongly, as to experience in view of them, a correspondent strength of delightful emotion. It may, it does, take such views of the perfections of God, of the plan of redemption, of the power of the Redeemer, of the glory that shall be revealed in the saints, and of other objects of a like kind, that it experiences an elevation and an intensity of happy feeling, almost too great to be borne, and such as it could not for any great length of time endure. But in general, christian joy on earth, is a calmer state of mind. It is rather a sweet serenity of soul than a state of

high rapturous excitement. Not, however, because there is not in the objects which awaken it, a tendency to produce strongly excited emotion, but partly because the mind cannot bear perpetual excitement, and partly because these objects are, in most cases, too dimly realized to make an impression on the mind corresponding with their intrinsic excellence and importance. God is too feebly apprehended; the Redeemer and his work are too obscurely seen; and all the great realities of the gospel are too much veiled from the eye of the mind, to allow their full impression to be made on the christian's heart. Hence, though these objects may at times be so apprehended by the believer, as deeply and powerfully to excite the sensibilities of his soul; yet this is not to be looked for as the ordinary state of his mind. Different individuals will indeed, owing to a difference in constitutional susceptibility and other causes, be affected with different degrees of religious feeling. The joy of some christians will be higher than that of other christians, while both have the same exciting causes before them, and that too without supposing any peculiar strength of religious principle in the former over the latter, as the cause of this difference. Still it is true, that in general, christian joy in the present circumstances of our being, is rather a calm sunshine of the soul, than a more highly excited state of feeling. It is that "peace" of which the Savior spoke, when being about to leave the world, and wishing to comfort his sorrowing disciples, he said, "peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you"—his peace—the sweet serenity of mind which he enjoyed himself, and in the enjoyment of which he went forward in the performance of every self-denying duty, and met with such calm dignity, such entire self-command, such cheerful resignation to the divine will, the overwhelming trials which he had to endure.

4. Christian joy is pre-eminently *joy in God* as our reconciled Father, through Jesus Christ. It relates to *him* as its great object. Other things may have a modifying influence upon it; may serve to heighten it; may give to it additional power over the other feelings of the soul; but still, the primary objective cause in calling it forth, is the infinite Jehovah. The thought that such a being lives and reigns and governs all things, in connection with the feeling of love to him, reliance on him, seeking his glory, obeying his will, and looking for his mercy through the blood of Christ, is that which, more than any thing else, awakens in the christian's soul its peculiar joy. It is when he draws near to *God* that he feels the purest, sweetest comfort. It is when he exercises trust in God, and consciously loves him, and commits all to him, and lives upon him, and feels so satisfied with his allotments as to be willing to be any thing and do any thing which he re-

quires;—it is then, that his joy is full. And why should it not be? Where else can such rational, solid, unfading joy be found? Other sources of happiness are unsatisfying. Worldly good is passing away. Where but on the living *God* can you fix the supreme affections of your heart, and amid all the revolutions of things here, and especially in view of the coming realities of eternity, feel safe and happy?

5. Christian joy is *compatible with repentance, self-humiliation and bearing the cross*. What is true repentance? The renunciation of our sins. And is there any thing in renouncing our sins, which is incompatible with peace and joy? What is evangelical self-humiliation? It is ceasing to think more highly of ourselves than we ought to think. It is taking our proper place in the great system of God. It is sinking down, voluntarily and cheerfully, to the just level of our deserts. And is there any thing inconsistent with our being happy in doing this? Is not this the way to be truly happy? Pride never contributed to our real enjoyment. Though we are sometimes disposed to “call the proud happy,” an undue exaltation of ourselves never led to rational and solid peace of mind. And what is bearing the cross? It is resisting our corrupt inclinations, separating ourselves from improper worldly pursuits and connections, and patiently following the Lord Jesus Christ, through the trials which he may see fit to appoint us. And what is there incompatible with christian comfort in doing this? Is not all this necessary to true comfort—in dispensable to the purity and sweetness of true christian joy?

6. Christian joy, though flowing chiefly from a direct regard for God, *does not overlook one's own personal good*. Christianity requires no stoical indifference to our own well-being. It does not require us, in order to our being truly and in that way happy, to disregard the advantage to ourselves which personal holiness will procure, and in order that we may put on a moral resemblance to our Maker, to cease to concern ourselves about our own happiness in doing so, as if it were necessarily a wrong thing, a mere exercise of selfishness, to desire to be happy. This, we conceive, is not christianity. This is not the will of God concerning us. God *requires* us to consult our own real well-being. He forbids us to sacrifice our true happiness; and assures us that this is an object on which his own heart is set, “as I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die?” God, we see, requires us, in the strongest and most solemn manner, to consult our own happiness. He bids us turn from our evil ways that we may *live*. And the burden of all his expostulations with sin-

ners is, that they would not perish, but that they would turn from their sins and be forever happy in his love.

III. Among the *causes* which have contributed to give to the piety of many christians a cold and joyless cast, we may mention the following.

1. There has been heretofore extensively prevalent, a *prejudice* against that peculiar cast of piety, which it is the object of these pages to recommend. It has been felt by many, that piety of this cheerful, happy kind, is to be suspected, as wanting in the requisite marks of solidity and genuineness. True piety, it has been assumed, must be of a more solemn, not to say, melancholy stamp; christians should guard against being too happy here; exalted joy in religion is to be looked for only in heaven. That this is a prejudice, and not a sentiment founded in truth or reason, has we trust, been already shown. The gospel, we are quite sure, has no tendency in itself, to produce a gloomy, joyless cast of piety. Its tendency is all of the opposite kind; it is fitted to make the true christian happy. If a cheerful state of mind is the legitimate result of any views which can be taken on any subject, those views of things which are appropriately christian are of this kind; and if any being on earth has reason to be of a joyful spirit, it is the child of God while living near to his Heavenly Father. But this sentiment, though so obviously founded in truth, has been sometimes perverted to encourage a false joy in religion; and persons have been led by it as thus perverted, to cherish a spirit of pride and self-complacency; their joy has not been in God, but in themselves; and thus a prejudice has been created in the minds of many against all religious joy of every kind.

2. Most christians *live too far from God* to derive much present comfort from their piety.

We have already seen, that a true religious joy is, chiefly, joy in *God*. It is that kind of happiness which results from loving and serving the greatest and best of beings, dwelling on his perfections, and striving to build up his kingdom. When therefore the christian lives so far from God that he scarcely knows, for considerable periods of time, whether he is loving and serving him or not, from any consciousness which passes within himself on this subject; when he seldom contemplates his Maker's perfections, or puts forth but few and feeble efforts to build up his kingdom; it can be no wonder that his piety does not make him happy; the reason why it does not is too apparent. He has too little to do with God to be happy in him. He is doing too little for Christ to have much peace and comfort in what he does in his service. His piety is rather adapted to make him unhappy, to inspire dread, to beget misgiving, to lead to darkness and doubt,

to awaken the reproaches of conscience, and to make the pleasures and business of the world a welcome refuge from her upbraiding voice. Such a life as many professed christians lead, is only adapted to plunge them into darkness, and to leave them destitute of all religious comfort. It is rather a matter of surprise, that living at such a distance from God, they have even *hope* left, to say nothing of peace and joy. Their piety is barely compatible with a trembling, faltering hope; it *can* yield them nothing more; and possibly this hope itself may be such as shall only make them ashamed at last for having indulged it.

3. Christians are sometimes *afraid* to let their piety make them joyful. They are jealous of the effect of it upon their own spirit. They are afraid it may "exalt them above measure;"—afraid that their joy may be false, or so transient, that if they should allow themselves to indulge those happy feelings, it would occasion an appearance of inconsistency in them, and might thus subject both themselves and the cause of Christ to reproach. There are seasons probably when most christians experience unusual comfort in the service of God. They have a peace which the world cannot give; joys which a stranger intermeddles not with. At such times they feel as if they *knew* "in whom they had believed," and were fully "persuaded that he is able to keep that which they have committed to him," and as if they could say unhesitatingly, "I love my God and taste his grace." But in the midst of all this sweet and happy assurance of mind respecting their acceptance with God, this thought arises within them, "I must restrain these joyful feelings, or they will exceed their proper bounds; I dare not indulge them; they may lead me into danger; perhaps my joy is merely a selfish feeling; at all events, it would be prudent to conceal my feelings from a gainsaying world, who can have no sympathy with me on this subject; to let my feelings be known to them, might seem like making myself a sort of public spectacle, and inviting to myself the gaze of an idle and impertinent curiosity." Many a christian probably has felt thus *afraid* to let his religious joy appear, or even to indulge it within his own breast, and through excessive caution on this point, has diminished his own happiness, and failed to do others the good which he might have done. We are acquainted with christians of no doubtful piety, who appear to feel that it is better for them to go mourning all their days, and to exhibit to others this sombre and disconsolate frame of spirit, than to feel and exhibit a lively satisfaction and joy in religion. But why should this be so? Is religion wronged or misrepresented by shewing that it makes us happy? Is the cause of Christ promoted by a timid, reluctant,

half suppressed manifestation of its appropriate practical tendencies to diffuse serenity, peace and joy through the soul?

4. *Mistaken or partial views of God* often lead to an unhappy cast of piety. In every just view of God we must regard him as *the great friend and patron of moral rectitude and virtue*. Righteous himself, rectitude in his creatures he must of course approve and love, with all the energy of his own infinite mind. Consequently he must be the friend of all who like himself, are engaged in promoting the interests of rectitude and virtue. This is his infinite benevolence. Thus he wills and thus he seeks the happiness of his creatures, by promoting purity and rectitude in them. Thus he seeks to make *us* happy, in the only way in which we *can* enjoy true and permanent happiness. Such is the being whom we are to love and to serve with all our powers; and is it not manifest that thus to love and serve him, is the very perfection of happiness, to an intelligent and accountable creature such as man is? But it is equally manifest, that we may take such views of God as to make our piety barren of all comfort, a cold, joyless, repulsive thing. If God is regarded in any other light than as the unchangeable friend of virtue and holiness, and in *that* sense as unchangeably and infinitely benevolent; if we consider him as desiring the existence of sin rather than holiness in its stead, as administering his providence for the purpose of leading multitudes to disobey rather than obey his commands, what is the tendency of such views but to awaken distrust and fear in the minds of all, whether christians or not? For, however we may love virtue and holiness ourselves, and however much in the exercise of this love we might desire and seek the happiness of mankind, and be willing to toil and labor and die to accomplish this end, still if we consider God as a being who chooses on the whole, that multitudes of his creatures should be sinful rather than holy and in that way happy, our very religion has a tendency to make us wretched. The more we love and desire the holiness and happiness of mankind, the more disappointed and joyless should we feel, in the contemplation of the character of God, *under this misapprehension of it*. But the doctrine of decrees has become associated in the minds of multitudes with such views. Where these prevail, it is impossible for men to think of God as the all-powerful and unchanging friend of *rectitude*, as having his heart unalterably set on what is right and good, in preference to all that is morally wrong and evil. With such views they cannot lay open their hearts to the full and overpowering sense of God's infinite goodness and benevolence as exhibited in the scriptures—"not willing that any should perish"—"having no pleasure in the death of him that dieth," and bringing in aid

of the cause of virtue, and with one undivided desire that they may succeed, all the affecting considerations of redemption, and all the motives of a state of eternal retribution.

5. Christian joy is too often prevented, or greatly damped, by suffering our thoughts *to dwell too exclusively upon ourselves*. In a former paper on the subject of christian assurance, we stated that a person might occupy himself so much with direct attempts to search his own heart, in order to settle the question of his piety, that instead of gaining light on that point by so doing, he would only be involving himself in deeper darkness; and that one of the best methods of arriving at a full assurance of hope respecting ourselves as christians, is to forget ourselves as the direct object of thought, and engage with all our powers in the service of God. In this way it will often happen, that a better knowledge of our piety will be acquired, while we are forgetting our little selves and are swallowed up wholly in doing the will of God, than by the most laborious, protracted efforts, employed with the direct view of ascertaining our spiritual condition. So on the point before us. Christian joy is sometimes, perhaps generally, best secured by forgetting ourselves, and by throwing our whole souls directly into the service of God. There is a tendency in dwelling much upon ourselves, to acquire a sickly, feeble, morbid cast of piety. Every thing about ourselves is comparatively little; much is wrong, and calculated in itself to bereave us of all hope and joy. The child of God who is continually dwelling on his own individual case, and who in all his service done for Christ, is chiefly thinking of it in some bearing which it has upon himself, will almost of course, be a timid, desultory, disconsolate christian; his joy cannot be like the joy of him who looks up to his Savior and sees what motive there is *there* to live, and believe, and die in so blessed a service; and who feels his heart prompting him to go and act accordingly. While he will be humble, and feel that he is "less than the least of all saints," he will ordinarily feel a quiet settled peace of mind,—sometimes his joy will be full; the Savior whom he loves and serves will give *his* peace to him. It was this that made the primitive christians so happy. It was this which led Paul and Silas to occupy the midnight hour, and in a prison too, in singing praises to God. It was a similar state of feeling in the Savior of men, which diffused such a sweet, calm sunshine through his soul. It is this same feeling of engagedness in the service of God, which makes all holy beings happy. This is the joy of heaven; and we are at no loss to see how that joy, in the happy spirits above, will glow and brighten forever and ever! Would you be a joyful christian then? Forget your little self, and let the service of God absorb your whole soul.

Look not upon your own things, but upon the things which are Jesus Christ's.

IV. We proceed to some *reasons* for cultivating a cheerful, happy spirit of piety,—reasons drawn especially from the circumstances of the age in which we live.

1. God is now calling the church to *peculiar labors and sacrifices to promote his cause*. The cast of piety which suits this age, is not of the retiring, inactive, contemplative kind. A cold, reserved, joyless cast of religion is not that which is now called for. Cheerful, happy, animated christians are wanted. The church has now something else to do besides to wait, and pray, and suffer, and exercise the passive graces of patience, and resignation, and retirement from the world, and hoping almost against hope for better days to come. She has her *work* assigned her; she is called to the *labor* of love, as well as to the *patience* of hope. Her utmost energies, in effort and action, are now put in requisition. The cause of missions is, now more than ever before, demanding her efforts. Revivals are creating an unexampled demand for action and labor. All the benevolent movements of the age seem to say, that the kind of christians now wanted is working christians, men who having put their hand to the plough, will not look back. But a cheerful, buoyant, happy cast of piety, has the best tendency to make christians of this description. Men must live so near to God as to feel the assurance and the comfort of their piety, in order to meet the exigencies of this age of the church. They must be christians of full stature, and of a joyful heart, and prompt to go forward where duty calls and hard work is to be done. A tame and timid piety will not answer for such a service, and at this day.

2. A cheerful cast of piety is desirable on account of its influence *by way of example*. Happy christians exhibit religion to others in an attractive light. They show, that religion is something truly worth possessing, inasmuch as it is something which makes them happy: This is an argument which all can understand, and such an exhibition of piety, in the life and example of christians generally, would do more to disarm prejudice, to open men's minds to conviction, and cause them to feel the excellence of religion, and their own need of it, and thus to prepare the way for their becoming christians themselves, than any direct efforts which it is possible to make for the promotion of piety, unsupported by the evidence of a cheerful religious life. Wicked men will look at your life, your feelings, your spirit, and not at what you tell them about the comforts of religion. One of the strongest minds we have ever known, and which had resisted for many years every other argument, was overcome at length by this. He

saw a striking example of the kind of piety we have been describing in these pages ; it went to his heart as an irresistible demonstration, and all his previous skepticism was at an end. It told him a truth so intelligible and so interesting, that he felt its subduing energy upon his proud spirit ; and to use his own language, "he went out and wept bitterly," under a conviction, felt now for the first time in his life, that he needed himself just that kind of transforming operation on his own heart, the happy fruits of which he had just witnessed in the case of another.

3. A cheerful cast of piety is desirable to obviate the tendency to *discouragement in religion*, which most men are prone to feel, and which peculiar circumstances may bring upon every christian.

There are few real christians who do not at some period of their life, and perhaps often, feel disheartened in their christian course. They meet perhaps with some unlooked for trials of their faith and fortitude. The enemy waxes bold ; wickedness gains ground around them. The truth is found to be powerless to roll back the swelling tide of iniquity ; the Spirit of grace is withdrawn ; the hands of God's people have become feeble ; and the ways of Zion mourn because few come to her solemn feasts. In such a state of things there is a strong tendency in the minds of most christians to discouragement. The difficulty is, that *God* is lost sight of. Christians, in such a state of things, are trying to walk by sight, not by faith, and hence discouragement comes almost of course. Now there is something in an habitually cheerful tone of piety to obviate this tendency to be discouraged, and to raise the sinking mind to peace and joy again, when it has yielded to discouragement. It is easier for the cheerful christian to find God again, and to regain lost comfort, when at any time he has momentarily suffered his trust in God to be shaken, and his religious peace of mind to be interrupted. There is a tendency in *his* mind, though occasionally it may have seasons of comparative depression, (and who is wholly free from them ?) to rise again to its wonted happy tone. It is no very slight cause that will hold such a mind long in darkness, or keep it back from the full fountain of its joys. But it is not so with the habitually cheerless and gloomy christian. In *his* mind discouragement not only takes place easily, and often, and at slight difficulties, but when it has taken place, it is far more difficult to remove it. Such christians consequently are unprepared to act efficiently for God in difficult and trying circumstances. It is the cheerful christian who must be put in the fore front of the battle, for he will return again and again to the conflict, undismayed by occasional repulses, and still confident and joyful in his King.

4. Many suppose, that we are now on the *confines of the pre-*

dicted millennial period of prosperity to the church. That this period is not very remote, there is much reason to believe; and of course, we may begin to look for the events which are to usher it in. One of these is the translation of the scriptures into all the languages of men. Another is the multiplication of missionaries to carry the word of God when translated, to all mankind. Another is a higher standard of piety in the church at large. Another, embittered and organized opposition on the part of the enemies of Christ. And another still, the coming out of the Most High from his secret place, to bear testimony to his own cause, and to pour darkness from his presence upon the camp of the enemy. How far these events are now taking place, we shall not stop to inquire; it is sufficient for our purpose, that they may be expected to precede the millennium, and to usher in its glory. But when these events shall take place, and in order to their taking place, what are we to suppose will be the cast of piety which will prevail generally in the church? How is it *now* in revivals of religion? Are not christians generally, at such times, more joyful and happy than at other times? When therefore the bible shall have free course, and missionaries shall be multiplied, and the tone of piety in the church shall be greatly elevated, and the enemies of Christ shall be driven to take sides and make common cause, and God shall come out to vex them in his sore displeasure, will there not be a state of feeling among the people of God, that will be in many respects new? Will there not be a more animated cast of piety, and the children of Zion be more joyful in their King? And is not this the spirit which it is necessary should exist, in a degree greater than any in which it now exists, in order to bring on the millennial day?

5. There is something in the *spirit of our free and happy institutions*, in this land of civil and religious liberty, which seems to call for cheerfulness and joy in all that love the cause of the Redeemer. The spirit of rational liberty is, in every department of human action, a joyful spirit. The spirit of despotism is dark and gloomy and sullen. Now when we consider the genius of our institutions, it seems as if christians in this land especially, and in the present state of the church, ought to be of a happy spirit. There is every thing to make them such. Why should they be cast down; why hang their harps on the willows? They are not sitting by the rivers of Babylon; they are not required to sing the Lord's song in a strange land. They are the citizens of a free and prosperous country. They are favored with distinguished privileges, such as in kind and degree no other people on earth are enjoying. How can they better acquit themselves of their peculiar obligations for so much favor shown them, or act

more in the spirit of their truly happy condition, than by exhibiting a cheerful, an animated, and a steadfast devotedness to the service of God ?

We know indeed that there are some wise and good men, who appear to think that the prospects of this country are growing dark ; that our sins are fast preparing the way for great and desolating judgments from God to be sent upon us ; and that even now the march of pestilence through the land is no doubtful sign that God has determined to "avenge himself on such a nation as this." The inference which they make is, that it is a time rather for weeping and mourning than for cheerfulness and joy in religion. That our provocations are great, as a nation, is indeed but too certain ; that we have reason to humble ourselves before God on account of our sins is also certain, for we are an ungrateful and wicked people. It becomes every christian in the land to lie in the dust, and to lift up to the ear of abused Goodness his imploring cries for mercy. And we rejoice to see so much evidence, in different and distant parts of our land, that multitudes are humbling themselves before God and supplicating his mercy, under the present chastenings of his providence. But we cannot for ourselves feel, that there is any reason for despondency : we cannot yet believe that God is about to give us up to ruin, much as we deserve it, and imminent and terrible as are the present tokens of his displeasure. Although there is a cloud of wrath hanging over us, there is, to our vision, a bow of promise spanning the storm. It is seen in the recent unexampled multiplication of revivals of religion in our land. Four-fifths of the churches in the State of Connecticut alone, visited with these special seasons of mercy within a year past ; and eight thousand souls, in one denomination of christians alone, and in this State, added to the Lord by a public profession of religion ! How many in the whole land ! And is this the land that is about to be abandoned of God and given up to ruin ? Are all these revivals and this great accession of strength to the cause of Christ for nothing, or only to make the impending ruin as it descends upon us, more signal and more exemplary ? We think not. Let the wicked, indeed, tremble ; *they* have every thing to fear. But let not the friends of Jesus Christ be dismayed. The bow of promise, we repeat, is upon the storm, spanning the whole breadth of its deep, dark folds. While God is now teaching us, by terrible things in righteousness, that the day of vengeance to his enemies is in his heart, he is also teaching us, by the recent mercies to his church, that the year of his redeemed is coming on. Let christians learn to confide in God, do their duty, and be cheerful and happy. Do you desire, christian brethren, to speed the triumphs of

your King? Is it your wish to see the tokens of his displeasure which in some respects are now manifest, succeeded by a brighter sunshine of peace and prosperity to his cause? Then be at once cheerful and unreserved in your devotedness to that cause. Pray with the confidence of strong hope. Give with a large, generous and joyful heart. Labor for Christ under the promptings of unwearied love for him and for his cause. Let your piety be seen by all to be a perennial fountain of peace and joy to your own soul, under the various appointments of divine providence here. Be *happy* christians. Exemplify in this and in every respect the genuine spirit of the gospel. Be like your divine master, in the purity, simplicity, and joyfulness, with which you devote yourselves to the service of mankind. Bring more of *his* serene and happy spirit into your work. Anticipate the felicities of heaven here below. Show that the church on earth and the church in heaven, are one body, in the nature of their joys, as truly as in the kind of obligations and duties which devolve upon them. In short, strive to bring more of heaven down to earth, and to elevate the church below nearer to the church above, in the peace and comfort, the humble assurance and holy joy, the love of God and the love of souls, with which your piety shall be distinguished.

ART. II.—THE WORKS OF LORD BACON.

The Works of Lord Bacon. Four vols. Fol. London: 1730.

The connection between philosophy and theology has been felt and acknowledged in all ages. Most christians have deplored the influence of the former upon the latter; but even those who have been loudest in their complaints, and strongest in their expressions of grief on this account, have given often the most melancholy proofs of this very influence. In view of this long and intimate union, however, and of the fact that philosophy may take its complexion from religion, as well as religion from philosophy, it becomes a question of no ordinary interest, whether God did not intend that the one should be perpetually a check upon the other? Did he not design that the strange tendency in philosophic minds to perverseness, pride, and atheism, should be continually restrained by the overawing influence of the proofs of religion every where present? And did he not intend also, that the vagaries of the human mind in religion, the romance and knight-errantry of theology—the tendency to fanaticism, and dogmatism, and mysticism, should be held in check by the influence of common sense, the knowledge of the true laws of mind, and the in-

vestigations of science from age to age? The relation of the sciences—the *vinculum commune* between them, was long ago remarked by Cicero. The mutual influence of *modern* sciences on each other, and of all on religion, is a much more important inquiry to a christian.

We have neither the time nor ability to enter into a full investigation of this subject. Nor indeed do we conceive that a *detailed* inquiry would so effectually answer the end we have proposed to ourselves in our work, as some other mode. To meet the demands of the present state of theological science, and to turn theological inquiries to the best practical account, it is not necessary in our view to proceed into much actual detail. We address ourselves to an age of inquiry. We speak in our pages to those who we believe are qualified, and are disposed, to think for themselves. We contemplate the existence of no barriers to investigation; no fetters to free inquiry; no want of diligence or disposition to follow out any train of thought, which may be suggested for practical use. It is our province to furnish topics for such inquiries; and the design which we have in view in our labors in the Christian Spectator, will not have been accomplished unless we have laid the foundation for investigation, and for active christian effort, long after our humble labors on earth have closed.

It is under the influence of reflections like these, that we wish to call the attention of our readers to the works of Lord Bacon. Our object will be accomplished if we can briefly exhibit his character; and can state the influence of his writings on science, and the kind of influence which the inductive philosophy is destined to exert particularly on the science of theology.

“For my name and memory,” said Bacon in his will, “I leave them to men’s charitable speeches, and to *foreign nations, and to the next ages.*” The reason of a part of this remarkable bequest is to be found in the melancholy fall of this illustrious man, to which we shall have occasion again to advert. In the close of the bequest—the legacy of his name to future times—we discover proofs of the same consciousness of immortality that prompted Milton to compose a work that the world “should not willingly let die.” Yet more than two centuries have passed away, and we have as yet no well written biography of this greatest of British philosophers. Till within a year, indeed, we had nothing that deserved to be called a life of Newton. Still it is not a little remarkable, that no one, prompted either by fame or usefulness, has presented to us a biography of such a man as Bacon. In the whole range of literature there is not a finer unoccupied field, than would be presented in the attempt to give the public a well written account of the author of the *Novum Organum*; of the

state of science at the time he lived, and of his influence on the interests of science, of literature, and of religion. Yet perhaps we shall ever be compelled to regret in regard to him,—a thing by no means uncommon in biography—that of his peculiar habits of life, his changes of opinion, the progress of his discoveries, and their immediate influence on men, we are to know nothing but a few most meager facts which have been rescued from oblivion.

There is another remark which we are here compelled to make respecting the works of Bacon. Few modern scholars, we fear, are acquainted with them—even with the *Novum Organum*. The study of them requires more time, patience, industry, perhaps *conscience*, than most men of modern habits are willing to appropriate to them. Bacon is regarded as belonging to a distant age and to long past times, and though his *name* is in every one's mouth, and his praises in all nations, yet how few are there who could give an intelligent account of his principles of philosophy? How few theologians, we are compelled to ask, have ever looked for a moment at the *Novum Organum*? Yet we are aware of its difficulty; and we are not disposed to utter the language of complaint against the men of our own times. We are convinced that though our generation should not sit down to the *formal* perusal and study of this profound work, yet there has gone forth from it an influence which reaches our age, and that we are, though unconsciously, reaping its benefits, as the Nile long shed fertility on the fields of Egypt, while the source of its waters was unknown; and as the rain and light of heaven diffuse their influence over the earth, while that influence may be unnoticed or forgotten. It has been asked with emphasis, “who now reads the *Rambler*?” And it is indubitable that this book, which once exerted so mighty an influence on the English language and people has given place, at least in general reading, to works of far inferior merit and interest. The reason seems to be, that its object is well nigh accomplished. It commenced with a standard of morals and language elevated far above the prevailing style of morals and of writing. It has elevated both, and has brought the English language and notions of morality, to its *own level*. Nor is it wonderful that men should regard with less interest a work which *now* is seen to have no very extraordinary elevation. It is a component part of English literature—having *fixed* itself in the language, the style, and the morals of the English people, and taken its place as an integral and almost undistinguished part of the national principles of writing and morality. The result is, that while the *benefits* of the *Rambler* may be diffusing themselves, unperceived, to almost all the endearments of the fireside, and virtues of the community, the book itself may be

very imperfectly known, and unsrequently perused. Johnson may be almost forgotten, except in praise; but his mighty power is yet sending forth a mild influence over lands and seas, like the gentle movements of the dew and the sunbeam. The same is true of Bacon. He has *incorporated himself* into all our science. He has imbedded his principles in the very foundation of all our improvements in astronomy, natural philosophy, and chemistry, and to a great extent, of mental science and theology. It is related of Phidias that in constructing the statue of Minerva at Athens, he so wrought *his own image* into her shield, that it could not be removed without destroying the statue. Thus Johnson has wrought himself into our language and morals;—and Bacon into our science. We have often endeavored to follow out the effect of his labors, by taking our present science and literature, and endeavoring to go back and remove step by step, year by year, and age by age, all that may have resulted from the influence of the “*instauration of learning*,” by Bacon.—No one can be aware of what he owes to that man, who is not able to thread all these mazes, and to trace all the unseen progress of his principles that have thus found their way, though from an unknown benefactor, into English science and literature.

The leading facts of Bacon's life are soon told. He was born on the 22d day of January, 1560. At an early age he graduated at Cambridge, and after having traveled for some time on the continent, became a student at law; and was at the usual period admitted to practice. During the reign of Elizabeth, in consequence of having rivals and enemies at court; he was either overlooked, or purposely prevented from obtaining offices of standing and honor. This period of his life was passed chiefly in the practice of the law; in writing some treatises on jurisprudence; and in preparation for the more elevated offices in the government, which he afterwards filled, and the more important advances in the sciences which he was destined ultimately to make. But though he was thus neglected by Elizabeth, and undistinguished by any external and substantial marks of her favor, yet he was often admitted as her counselor, and enjoyed to a considerable degree her confidence. On the accession of James I., Bacon advanced rapidly through various offices in the gift of the crown. Of James he says in a letter to him, that “he had raised and advanced him nine times; thrice in dignity, and six times in office. He was successively counselor extraordinary to his majesty; king's solicitor general; attorney general; counselor of state; lord keeper of the great seal, and lord chancellor. From this last office he was degraded for corruption, after having held it two years, and devoted the remainder of his life to the pursuits of

philosophy. During this period of four years, his principal philosophical works were written. He died on the 9th of April, 1636.

There is little pertaining to the early life and actions of this illustrious man, on which we wish to offer any remarks. Indeed, it would be difficult to present to our readers any thing like a just biography of his early years. There are no memorials of those years; no records of his mode of study, and his advances in science; of his changes of views, and his projects of ambition; nothing that will acquaint us with the manner by which his mind was trained to the amazing stature which it afterwards obtained. Nothing could be more interesting or useful, than to follow out the development of such an intellect, and to trace the influence of external causes, and internal principles and emotions, in framing a character whose influence has been already felt in all the departments of science and of morals. But we are doomed to sigh unavailingly over the lamentable defects of the biography of illustrious men. One *hint* only is recorded which sheds some light on the development of his early powers. It is said of him that at the early age of sixteen years, while at the university, "he fell into the dislike of the philosophy of Aristotle; not for the worthlessness of the author, to whom he would ever ascribe all high attributes, but for the unfruitfulness of the way, being a philosophy only strong for contentions and disputations, but barren of the productions of works for the benefit of the life of man." At a time when the philosophy of Aristotle was enthroned in the universities of Europe; when his decision was law in all the investigations of philosophy; when for almost two thousand years he had swayed an undisputed scepter over all that part of the world which claimed to be civilized, it was no slight indication of independence of mind even to *doubt* the infallibility of his decisions, and no unpromising omen of the advance which was afterwards to be made by him in the sciences. Aristotle and Bacon now stand at the head of the two great sects of philosophers that have divided mankind. It was the high honor of the one, that mankind for ages yielded their heads and hearts to his decisions, and bowed to his authority. It was the unrivaled glory of the other, that he displaced him from his proud elevation, and introduced a *new method* of investigating truth, that has forever broken the scepter which the philosopher of Greece so long swayed over mankind.

It is not our purpose to offer any remarks on the character of Bacon as a lawyer. He was the rival of Coke; and it is not easy to estimate which of the two was the more eminent man in this department of human science. Had Bacon confined his researches to that which seems to have limited the ambition of Coke, it would be a matter of more moment to institute the com-

parison. The admirers of legal attainments might then delight to inquire, which of these two men was entitled to the highest honors of his profession. But the name of Bacon naturally suggests to us far different attainments from those which adorned the bar or the bench. We forget the robes of the lawyer, and the dignity of the ermine. The advocate, the counselor, the chancellor, the titles of nobility are lost in the profound attainments of the man of science, and the restorer of learning. We may just remark, however, that the united testimony of Bacon's contemporaries, award to him the highest attainments as a lawyer, and a full, rich, and flowing eloquence, that placed him deservedly beside the Roman pleader; and that while he was speaking "the only fear was lest he should make an end." Of the correctness of his legal opinions and decisions, as chancellor, we have the highest proof that has ever been furnished in any case. Though he was accused and convicted of receiving bribes; though he confessed the crime, and was sentenced to a heavy penalty; and though some were given *pendente lite*, and probably with the express intention on the part of those who offered them, to influence his decision in their favor, yet it is recorded to his lasting honor, and it comes to us as a solace, when we think of the fate of this illustrious man, that not one of his decisions was reversed or called in question as unjust.

Bacon was not only a man of profound legal attainments, but was also eminent in the various departments of general literature. With the classic purity and elegance of his Latin style, every man must be struck who has read the *Novum Organum*. But we feel more interest in remarking, that there is no where to be found a better exhibition of the power of the English Language, than in his prose writings. For manliness, and strength; for purity and occasional elegance of diction; for copious and varied illustrations; for terseness, compactness, and the absence of all expletives, and the use of such words and phrases as leave the thought clear and transparent to the view, we know not where there can be found better models than his *Essays*. Less full and flowing than Milton; less dense and compact, perhaps, than Butler; less filled with varied imagery, and the creations of fancy, than Taylor; less argumentative and stately, it may be, than Barrow; and less majestic and pompous than Johnson, he had yet in a rare union, what we most admire in all. He has placed on his pages, in wonderful combination, those excellencies of style which have given immortality to so many other men. And if any one wishes to understand the beauty and force of the English language, we know not how he can better do so, than by becoming familiar with the writings of this illustrious man.

Nor was his excellence in this respect, apparently, a matter of particular study. His mind was full of thought, and he gave utterance to his thoughts in pure and majestic English, that makes us love our language more, and exult in the possession of so noble a medium of conveying the loftiest conceptions and the most enlarged philosophy to mankind.

But it is not as a lawyer, or a man of literature, that we wish now to contemplate this illustrious man. We wish to look at the influence of his philosophy on that holy cause to which our pages are consecrated. We believe that this influence has gone far, and is destined to go still farther into all the departments of christian theology. We believe it is inevitable that the prevailing philosophy shall exert a wide influence over the theology of our age. We do not doubt that it ought to do so. Not that it is to control the bible, or set aside its decisions; but that it is to hold in check certain vagaries of the human mind, which bigots, and zealots, and theological antiquarians would persuade us are conformed not only to the tradition of the elders, but to the testimony of the scriptures themselves. There is a wonderful charm to many minds in a theological dogma, where it can be *pretended* that it has been held "time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary." And there is a marvelous shrinking, and expression of abhorrence, when philosophical dogma is summoned to meet dogma, and the rules of a correct philosophy are employed to uncanonize and dethrone these elements of ecclesiastical tyranny. Our remarks then are designed to lead to a just estimate of the influence of the philosophy of Bacon, on the science of Europe; of his religious character; of the applicability of his philosophy to theology; and the effect which would be produced by an unsparing application of those principles to the theology of modern times.

We do not deem it necessary to enter at large into the inquiry about the state of science when Bacon wrote his *Novum Organum*. There are two great departments of knowledge on which such a mind would act—the one pertaining to the physical sciences, the other embracing the vast department comprehended under the general term of metaphysics. We have given a full statement of the condition of the latter when we say, that this entire department was, till the time of Bacon, under the influence of the philosophy of Aristotle.* He reigned in the schools; he controlled the

* "Towards the close of the fifth century, the influence of Aristotle began to prevail over that of Plato, in the christian world. After considerably declining in the sixth century, it again revived; and in another century it had gained such an ascendancy, that Aristotle seems every where to have been triumphant.

systems recorded in the books; he fixed the metes and bounds of inquiry; he swayed a scepter over the entire invisible world, into which man might be disposed to push his investigations. More than all, this philosophy had incorporated itself with all the *religious* dogmas of Europe, and was imposed on the belief of men with all the sanctions of the most terrific and iron-featured superstition that has ever extended a scepter of night over the world. During centuries of darkness this system had been compacted, and with infinite toil of profound metaphysicians had received its shape,

“ If shape it might be called, that shape had none
 “ Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb;
 “ Or substance might be called that shadow seemed.”

It is common now, to speak of the system with contempt. We despise it because it has passed out of view, and we deem it not worth inquiry. We look on it as we do on desert sands which we are not bound to traverse; and on dark and pestilential and frightful abodes, which we are afraid to enter. But they who have looked at the system are the last to hold it in contempt as an effort of profound and subtle argumentation; and the last to wonder that it exerted such an amazing influence on mankind. We have only to remember that it required the best part of a man's life to become acquainted with the dialectics of Aristotle and his commentators; that it was deemed indispensable to education to be master of the philosophy of the schools; that it was linked by a thousand ties to the reigning superstition; that the colossal power of the Roman see, was sustained chiefly by the prevalence of this philosophy; and that to doubt the dogmas of that superstition, and of course the philosophy of Aristotle, subjected a man to the horrors of the inquisition,—and we shall cease to wonder that it so long swayed its scepter over mankind.

The reformation had made an incipient aggression on the authority of the Stagyrice, at the same time that the reformers had defied the thunders of the Vatican. But no mighty genius had

Glosses, paraphrases, summaries, arguments, and dissertations on his works, were composed without end, as if to make darkness visible. Many of the inhabitants of the West learned Arabic, in order to read a translation of them into that language. Men were every where taught to believe in *matter, form, and privation*, as the origin of all things; that the heavens were self-existent, incorruptible, and unchangeable; and that all the stars were whirled around the earth in solid orbs. Aristotle's works were the great text book of knowledge, and his logic was the only weapon of truth. Christians, Jews, and Mahometans, united in professing assent to the great law-giver of human opinions; not Europe alone, but also Africa and Asia, acknowledged his dominion; and while his Greek originals were studied at Paris, translations were read in Persia and Samarcand.”—*Brougham's account of Bacon's Novum Organum.*

yet arisen who was competent to strike an effectual blow at its colossal power. It was reserved for Bacon to put an end forever to the system, and to introduce a method of inquiry, which was to annihilate the dominion of Aristotle. At the early age of sixteen, as we have seen, he called in question the correctness of this mode of investigation; and his philosophical life was little more than an effort to rescue the world from the protracted tyranny, and to lay the foundations of a nobler method of inquiry.

It will be recollected, that the difference between Aristotle and Bacon, related to the *proper mode of investigating truth*. The philosophy of the schools dealt in abstractions. It did not look at facts, but at theories; not at visible and tangible realities, but at fancied essences; not at the world as it is, but at an ideal world; not at things which God had formed, but at the creations of a subtle and refined philosophy, which age after age had labored to reduce to consistency and to form. The designs and labors of the schoolmen, we cannot better present than in the words of Bacon.

Surely like as many substances in nature which are solid, and do putrify and corrupt worms; so it is the property of good and sound knowledge to putrify, and dissolve into a number of subtle, unwholesome, and (as I may term them) vermiculate questions which indeed have a kind of quickness, and life of spirit, but no soundness of matter, or goodness of quality. This kind of dogmatic learning did chiefly reign among the school-men, who having sharp and strong wits, and abundance of leisure, and little variety of reading, but their wits being shut up in the cells of a few authors, (chiefly *Aristotle* their dictator) as their persons were shut up in the cells of monasteries and colleges, and knowing little history either of nature or time, did out of no great quantity of matter and infinite agitation of wit, spin out into those laborious webs of learning which are extant in their books. For the wit and mind of man, if it work upon matter, which is the contemplation of the creatures of God, worketh according to the stuff, and is limited thereby; but if it work upon itself, as the spider worketh his web, then it is endless, and brings forth indeed cobwebs of learning, admirable for the thread and work, but of no substance and profit."—*Advancement of Learning*, vol. ii. p. 428.

Yet in regard to their talent Bacon renders them the following just acknowledgment.

Notwithstanding, certain it is, that if the school-men, to their great thirst of truth and unwearied travel of wit, had joined variety and universality of reading and contemplation, they had proved excellent lights, to the great advancement of all learning and knowledge; but as they are, they are great undertakers indeed, and fierce with dark seeking. But as in the inquiry of the divine truth, their pride inclined them to leave the oracle of God's word, and to varnish in the mixture of their own inventions; so in the inquiry of nature, they ever left the oracle of God's works, and adored the deceiving and deformed images, which the unequal mirror of their own minds, or a few received authors or principles did represent unto them. Vol. ii. p. 429.

One can scarcely help reflecting here, what an amazing advance the unwearied toils of the schoolmen might have made, had their

efforts been directed by some such work as the *Novum Organum*. Had the profound talent of Duns Scotus been employed on the works of nature, or in investigating the properties of mind in any useful way, it is possible that we might never have heard the names of Bacon, Locke, or Newton, or have heard of them only as carrying the discoveries of science far into the regions that are now untrodden by living men, and clothed to human view in the shades of profound and "ever during darkness."

We do not deem it necessary to dwell on the state of science in Europe when Bacon lived. We have not room to do it. Those who wish for detail on this subject—perhaps the most interesting that the history of mind and opinions furnishes—will find it in the works which have, in modern times, attempted to establish just views of mental and moral science. Reid and Stewart have presented this in ample detail.

The grand achievement of Bacon was to break the power of this despotism over the mind. To this work no small part of his active life was devoted. In the midst of the toils of office and of law, while seeking for preferment at the feet of his sovereign, (for this was the grand foible of this illustrious man,) and while discharging the duties of a profession which at all times has been deemed enough to occupy the time and energies of the profoundest and most active minds, did this distinguished lawyer lay the foundation of that system on which now rests his fame. He then conceived and digested the plan of his great work on the *Advancement of Learning*; and he had so looked over the field of human science, so estimated its defects and its wants; and so contemplated the *objects* at which science should aim, that nothing was needed but a few years of leisure, to establish principles which should ultimately change the entire aspect of human science and opinions.

It is to one of those strange and mysterious events, which we are perpetually called upon to deplore in the history of man, that we owe the accomplishment of this great design. While making these preparations, Bacon was in the enjoyment of offices and preferments that would have satisfied any man of moderate ambition. But he sought a seat near the *ear* of majesty, and aspired to the highest offices to which a British subject can be elevated. He obtained his wishes; James advanced him to the dignity of lord chancellor, and conferred on him the keeping of the great seal of England. Had his life been spent in the duties of that high office, it is probable that his name would have been known to us, if at all, only in British heraldry, or in the books and records of jurisprudence. But this illustrious man, to use an expression applied by the profligate Horace Walpole to every man, "had his price;" and in two years the chancellor of Great Britain was degraded

from his office ; fined to the amount of fifty thousand pounds ; sentenced to be imprisoned at the king's pleasure ; and forever excluded from holding any office under the British government. Of the justice of this sentence, which, so far as the fine and imprisonment were concerned, was soon remitted—no one ever entertained a doubt. Of the nature of the offense, and the influence which it should have in forming an estimate of his character, we shall have occasion to speak in the course of this article.

After a fall like this, most men would have abandoned every effort ; and sunk in hopeless despondency, would have blushed to give publicity to their names even by the most splendid discoveries of science. After such a fall most of the ancients would have put a period to their lives. Cato fell by his own hand, unaccused of the crime that dishonors the name of Bacon ; and Cassius sought his own death amid misfortunes that to a sensitive mind would have been less overwhelming, than was this degradation to the chancellor of England. But it was here, that the nobleness, and we hope the religion also, of this illustrious man, triumphed. He gave himself not up to despondency. He laid aside the insignia of office, and sought honors beyond what the courts or cabinets of kings could ever bestow.

After his deposition from office, Bacon lived about five years. The closing years of his life he gave entirely to the pursuits of philosophy, and the perfecting and completing of his great works on science. During this period it does not appear that he ever sighed for the honors which he had once so ardently sought, or that he ever wept over the favors of royalty which he had so ignominiously lost. His great mind sought employment in contemplating the advances which science might make, and in laying the foundation for those astonishing improvements which science in all its departments has since made.

The principles of the inductive philosophy, which Bacon reduced to a system, if he did not originate, are easily told and easily understood. To us therefore at the present day, it is not very easy to understand why the establishment of such a system should have given to him a celebrity which surpasses all that had before been regarded as great among men. To understand it, it would be necessary to go back to the early periods of science, to watch its slow advances, to look at the mistakes which have been made in all the eras of philosophy. At every step, we should pause and wonder, that the obvious principles of the inductive method should not sooner have presented themselves to men. At almost every step we should see philosophy approaching the very principles of the *Novum Organum* ; we should see men half disposed to leave the trammels of *theories*, and to go forth in the manliness of just phi-

philosophic inquiry to look at nature as she is; and at every step we should be amazed that men drew back from these obvious paths of inquiry, and retreated into the dark shades and bewildering paths of abstract speculation. This tendency of the human mind to frame theories, rather than to look at facts, to forsake the obvious and plain paths of inquiry for vain and delusive vagaries, we regard both in the scientific, and theological world, as one of the most remarkable and melancholy perversities of the human intellect, any where presented in the history of the race.

There are but two ways of attempting to understand the works of nature, or of ascertaining the relations and properties of things. One is for the philosopher to sit down in his grove or closet, and attempt to frame in his own mind what nature *ought* to be; the other to become the *interpreter* of nature, and to tell the world what she is. The one attempts, on the basis of a few facts imperfectly ascertained, isolated in their character, and little understood in their connections, to frame a theory that shall account for all the facts in the world, and to construct a bed of Procrustes to reduce all the theories and facts to the same dimensions; the other approaches the works of creation as the Son of God directed his disciples to come to him, with the spirit of little children, and humbly to sit down at his feet. The former course was the most difficult, the least obvious, and was capable of being made to amaze and confound the intellects of men. It would give the longest and most profound employment to the intellect; would most effectually separate philosophers from other men, and introduce what men of philosophic temperament have commonly sought—the honors of *caste*;—an elevation above the millions of humbler mortals beneath their feet. This strange obliquity of the human mind we are compelled to trace, country after country, and age after age, in the history of science. It constituted alike the teaching of Aristotle, of Pythagoras, of Plato. The only man in antiquity who seems in any measure to have been free from it, was Socrates; and even *his* instructions referred almost solely to morals. We are often led to wonder at the little advances which science made in antiquity. We go to Egypt the parent of civilization, of learning, and even of art. What has ever been found there, in relation to the sciences, that would entitle her to the very lowest place now in our schools? When we admire the monuments of her power; when we look upon her pyramids, or enter them; or when we wander among the broken columns of Thebes, and are impressed with the proofs of her vast physical power, we are instinctively prompted to pause and ask, where are the monuments of her science? What advances did she ever make in the knowledge of that which could ultimately contribute to the spread

of true knowledge among mankind? Of what use was it to the world to construct her pyramids, her obelisks, her sphynxes, or her labyrinths? The playthings of kings, fit monuments of children or fit tombs of mortals who could seek immortality in them, while the great mass of intellect beneath them groveled in the most revolting idolatry, and only lived to accomplish what *we* now do much better by the help of the ox or the steam engine.

We are not less struck with the absence of the plainest principles of science even in Greece and Rome. We do not undervalue classic learning, or wish to banish it from the schools. Yet we cannot but be struck with the almost total want in the classic remains of antiquity, of any very valuable explanation of even the more common phenomena. What a conception far, far beyond the loftiest thoughts of antiquity, is presented by the simplest truths of modern astronomy? Though this science among the Chaldeans, the Persians, and the Greeks, was that to which most attention had been paid, and on which they would probably have rested their highest claims to celebrity, yet to what did it amount? To a few theories involved, unintelligible, and undemonstrated, about the *possible* order in the movements of the heavenly bodies; to the formation, with infinite toil and childish care, of *pictures* of the heavens—arranging the stars into constellations, and giving them outlines, having a fanciful resemblance to some object among animals or reptiles. What was more obvious in the healing art, than to approach the human frame and *examine* it by dissection? Yet this was never done. What more plain than to collect *facts* in regard to diseases, and arrange them by patient induction, and from the science of physiology, and the recorded facts, to attempt to *cure* men? Yet the ancient practice of medicine under Galen and in the entire ancient world, was simply to *prevent* disease, and not to *cure* it. By rules of hygiene, and systems of dietetics, they sought to *parry* and ward off the attack, and were strangers to the art of restoration. One of the most obvious and amazing instances of the want of science in antiquity, related to the simplest laws of hydrostatics. The aqueducts of Jerusalem, of Rome, and of Gaul—of all ancient cities and towns, are probably among the most striking monuments on earth, of an entire ignorance of the most simple laws of science, among people so refined and intelligent as they are acknowledged to have been. So amazing has it appeared that one of the simplest laws of hydrostatics should have been unknown to them, that their admirers have sought in vain for some reasons of pride or state, to account for such vast expenditures in supplying their cities with water.

The ancients knew nothing of the present system of arithmetic. The science of *numbers* among them was exceedingly complica-

ted, and never carried beyond what to us are its simplest elements. They knew nothing of Algebra, and of course nothing of the stupendous calculations to which it has given rise, and nothing of the easy and extended advances which it could give to geometry. They had not learned to simplify profound and laborious calculations by the aid of logarithms, and were utter strangers to fluxions. They had not attained to any just mode of the mensuration of the earth; a matter of so great moment to astronomy, navigation, and commerce. They had not been made acquainted with the mariner's compass; and their navigation was confined to narrow streams, or to the vicinity of the main land. The laws of gravitation were to them unknown; and of course all the science and all the useful arts now dependent on those laws. Nothing can be more complicated or unsatisfactory, than the cycles and epicycles of ancient astronomy, and though in all this, as well as in the labors of Aristotle, we discern proofs of profound talent and indefatigable toil, yet we find also convincing proofs, that we are contemplating there, what Bacon insists should be called the *infancy*, and not the *antiquity* of the world.

We are struck with the same thing in the mechanic arts. The application of water, for example, to turn a mill—a thing so obvious to us,—is not known to have been accomplished in Greece, and was not attempted at Rome till near the age of Augustus. The propulsion of the saw by any other power than by the hand, was a novelty in England so late as the sixteenth century. Nothing like the *pump*—an instrument so obvious to us, was known to any of the ancient nations.*

These observations might be extended to almost any length. But it is sufficient here to ask of any student of the ancient classics, or any admirer of the ancient philosophy, what valuable fact, or just philosophic theory has he ever found in all the ponderous tomes that have traveled down to us from Greece, and Rome? For what single just theory is he indebted to all the master spirits of the ancient world? We have often been amazed at the slow advances which science made. With all that we admire in the acuteness of their intellect, the richness and splendor of their diction, the profoundness of their moral sayings, the grandeur of their military achievements, and the unrivaled beauty of their specimens of art, we have still seen that there was some mighty spell over all their attempts at science, there was some spirit of darkness that blasted all their efforts, and withered their energies, and completely stayed their advances in the march to those high attainments which

* Webster's Lecture before the Mechanics' Institution.

now so dignify and ennoble man. We know no reason for this but the dominion which a love of *theory* had gained in all the nations of antiquity. We see there the first movements of that despotism which was destined to reign over Europe for many centuries, and to bury at last in one common grave just mental philosophy, large and liberal views, national freedom, and refinement, as well as to stay all advances in science and the arts.

We might also extend these remarks to other nations, and we should find the same fondness for theory extending itself, and spreading a baleful influence over all the efforts of science and of art. It is customary to acknowledge with gratitude our obligations to Arabia for some of the most important advances in science, particularly in the science of chemistry. It is not our wish to lessen this feeling of gratitude. But we cannot withhold the expression of our regret, that the principles of the philosophy of induction were unknown to the Arabians. Even in that land, so remote for a long time from the influence of the Aristotelian philosophy, we discern traces of the same unhappy tendency first to construct a theory, and then examine nature to establish it. The Arabian *assumed* that all metals might be transmuted into gold. He framed a theory that all metallic substances could be traced to a single basis, and that the purest metals could be produced from the least valuable. Nature was subjected to the torture, to establish this theory; and the discoveries which were actually made, were the result of accident, and made not because they were sought, but because in the endless investigations which were set on foot, it was *impossible* that they should entirely escape notice. It was *assumed* that there was somewhere an elixir of life, a universal preventive of disease, and prolonger of life. To discover this, was the object of the toil of centuries. It of course failed; but in the vain and Quixotic effort, many important facts could not but force themselves on the attention of mankind. What would not half the talent and skill expended in these vain and fruitless pursuits, have produced under a happier and wiser system of philosophy? It is needless for us to dwell on the unhappy influence of the philosophy of Aristotle, during the middle ages. There never has been so long and unbroken a spell over the energies of mankind, as during that dismal period. The human mind has no where else exhibited so remarkable a perversity; nor is there any where to be found so sad a commentary on the influence of a false philosophy. Age after age was employed in compacting and digesting the dark and terrible system. As it came from the hand of Aristotle, it had much to command admiration. It was to appearance a harmless system. Had it remained in Greece it would not probably have greatly fettered the minds of men, or retarded

the progress of science. The truth is, that the philosophy of Plato, and Aristotle, and Pythagoras, did not much affect the common mind. It was understood to be adapted only to the grove and the Lyceum. The great mass of mind was to be unaffected by it; and we do not know that the majority of the Greek population was influenced at all, by all the labors of those illustrious men. But during the rise of the papal dominion in Europe, it became indispensable that some system of philosophy should be at the control of the priesthood, that would extend and prolong the shades of darkness as far as the scepter of the papal power could be made to extend. Some scheme was necessary that should repress investigation, that should convince mankind that all wisdom, as well as power, was located near the Vatican; and that should effectually fetter and bind the human faculties, and stay for ages the advance of thought. The grand thing needed, to give ascendancy and stability to the papacy, was some system that should treat inquiry as constructive heresy, and brand novelty of opinion as dangerous to the purity and power of the church. Had this been left to the *invention* of the friends of the rising spiritual tyranny, we believe that there was not cunning or talent enough among all the adored and canonized fathers of the church, to have devised any effectual scheme. But the work was made ready to their hands, long before even the coming of Christ. The scheme had been framed by one of the profoundest minds that ever approached the topics of human inquiry. Nothing more was wanting effectually to confirm the aspirations of the papacy, to repress inquiry; to chain the mind down to ignorance; to prepare it for all the legends, and fooleries of the monastic life, and to fit it to receive all the claims of the papal power, than to give such a direction to the philosophy of the Stagyrice, as to adapt it to the common mind, and bestow on it all the tremendous sanctions of religion. This was done. Its reign was secured, and when we see what it was expected to accomplish by it, we cease to wonder that it should call forth the profound talents of such men as Duns Scotus, and even the devoted piety of Thomas Aquinas. When these shades were stretched over the church; when it was understood that this withering philosophy was to attend the dogmas of the papal see, we cease to wonder at its long and gloomy reign. It was sustained by the mightiest talents then on earth; it was urged forward by all the learning that lingered in the monastic cells; by all the achievements of the papal arms; by all the mighty power of religious principle when misdirected; by the energies of a dark and dismal superstition; and finally, by all the terrors of the inquisition, and the flames of persecution. Every engine of cruelty in the Spanish dungeons, tended to confirm the reign of Aristotle;

and every flame kindled in the valleys of Switzerland, was designed to confirm and prolong the dark and gloomy domination. It became necessary to fetter and bind *all* the faculties of the soul. Scientific investigations would, at any period, have overthrown the power of the papacy. Large and liberal indulgence given to the cultivation of any single faculty of the mind, would have ultimately set the mind wholly free. The improvement of any single department of science or learning, would have emancipated the human powers, and stayed the desolating reign of the papal supremacy among men. You cannot give enlargement to one of the faculties of the mind, without affecting all. You cannot emancipate man in one department of learning, without ultimately sending a healing and redeeming influence over all that gives rise to inquiry, or that ennobles and purifies man. Hence we see how difficult and slow was the progress of the reformation. On any effort to emancipate the mind in any department, there rested this superincumbent mass consolidated for ages. Wherever there was in any department, however obscure, a disposition to inquire, or to doubt, it was the certain precursor of the thunders of the Vatican, and of the terrors of the inquisition. Every nook and corner of the Roman dominion was searched as with the hundred eyes of Argos; every change of opinion, or advance in science, called to the spot the concentrated vigilance and power of the whole Roman see. Roger Bacon early made advances in science, and was one of the first who acted on the principles of the inductive philosophy, but his improvements died with himself, and for centuries his was a solitary name connected with philosophy, in the whole compass of the Roman domination. Jerome of Prague, and Huss, and Wickliffe, dared to think for themselves, and to doubt the infallibility of the prevalent opinions; and the flames of persecution terminated the lives of two of them, and indignity was offered to the bones and the works of the other. Galileo constructed a telescope, exposed to the eye of man the absurdities of the prevailing philosophy, and laid the foundation for the modern discoveries in astronomy; and he was rewarded with a place in the dungeons of the inquisition. With so keen an eye did the Roman see discern, that the slightest advance in science would tend to destroy its far spread domination, and liberate man from the ignoble and slavish chain. And we may here remark, that the distinguishing features of the papal see in modern times, though varied, are not essentially changed. It is still true, that the philosophy of Aristotle holds *as real* a sway over the Romish church as ever; and it is true, that it looks with as real a jealousy as ever on the advances which men are disposed to make, and on freedom of opinion, as it did on the opinions of Wickliffe, or of Galileo.

The reformation under Luther broke this mighty power. It was necessary that some tremendous shock should be given to the Roman see, and set the human mind at liberty, and it was done. God raised up men formed for those times, men evidently adapted to make vast changes, and originate stupendous revolutions among men. The papal power once broken; the project of confining all learning to the cells of the monastery being for ever put to an end by the discovery of printing; the terrors of the inquisition, and the anathemas of the triple crown being ineffectual to prove the telescope to be false; and the superincumbent load of superstition, and crimes, in the papal dominion being beyond human endurance, the reformation by one mighty effort threw off the incumbent mass, and man walked forth dignified with the privilege withheld for centuries, of *thinking for himself*. The great truth went forth, never more to be recalled, that man was to be at liberty to frame his own opinions, and that the last successful effort *had* been made effectually to fetter and paralyze the human powers.

It is interesting to the friends of science, to trace the slow advances which were made toward the great truths which now enoble science. We have already adverted to the labors of Roger Bacon, and the discovery of the telescope by Galileo. We may now remark, that many of the maxims of the inductive philosophy were acted on before they were collected and arranged by Bacon. Thus in the year 1596, John Kepler published his peculiar views on the Harmonies and Analogies of Nature. This was a book constructed wholly on the prevalent system of philosophy, in which he attempts to solve what he calls "the cosmographical mystery of the admirable proportion of the planetary orbits;" and by means of the six regular geometrical solids he endeavors to assign a reason why there *are* six planets, and why the dimensions of their orbits, and the time of their periodical revolutions, were such as Copernicus found them. Perhaps not even in the trifling, but more laborious toils of the schoolmen, could there be found a more melancholy illustration of the prevalent philosophy. A copy of this work was presented by its author to Tycho Brahe, who had been too long versed in the realities of close observation to attach any value to such wild theories. He advised his young friend, "first to lay a solid foundation for his views by actual observation, and then by ascending from these, to strive to reach the causes of things."* On this principle Brahe had long acted, and by the aid of it had reached a distinguished elevation in the philosophical world. On this principle Kepler appears afterwards to have

* Brewster's Life of Newton, p. 120.

acted, and under the guidance of the Baconian philosophy thus compressed into a single paragraph, he abandoned his visionary inquiries, and laid the foundation of that distinguished character for philosophic inquiry, which he subsequently obtained. Philosophers were beginning gradually to abandon the long established maxims of the schools. They began to discover the inutility and barrenness of their speculations. Incidentally, and at intervals, they expressed some great sentiment, which if followed out would have freed them from the domination of the prevailing systems. They saw that under the advancing prevalence of the new principles of inquiry, the universe began, to their view, to assume a new aspect; discoveries in science had already characterized the sixteenth century, far more in number and importance than had marked the whole reign of the philosophy of Aristotle, and the way was manifestly opening for some still more splendid advances in science.

At this auspicious period Bacon rose. The world had manifestly worked itself into a form adapted to the molding of some such mighty mind. Some comprehensive genius was demanded by the circumstances of the age, that could look at once at all the departments of science, ascertain and record all that had been done, and that was still defective; point out the errors that had pervaded all the investigations of past generations, expose the causes of the slow progress of science, of its repeated defeats, its little utility, and point out the true paths of philosophic research. Some single mind of vast native powers and attainments, was needed to collect the incipient, though scattered maxims of the true philosophy, and present them in an embodied form; that should trace their *real* influence in the hands of Friar Bacon, of Galileo, of Tycho Brahe, and of Kepler; and that should show in what way the same principles might be applied to all the departments of human investigation. Such a man was Bacon. Nor was there ever a human being so well fitted to occupy this ground as he. He seems to have been fitted by a wise providence, to stand at the base of the towering and superincumbent system, which had so long held in ignoble bondage all the human powers, and to hasten its decline; and to frame a scheme that should be adapted to all future times, and to set up land-marks along the paths of all the departments of science. Nor do we know that there have ever been put forth more vast and comprehensive views, than those which characterized this illustrious man. The principles of his philosophy are simple, even to the comprehension of a child; and yet vast enough to meet all the investigations of the modern astronomy, to direct all the inquiries of the natural philosopher and chemist, and to give law to all the investigations of mind.

The two great departments of Bacon's work were designed to

state what are the proper objects of science, its advances, and its defects; and to submit the outlines of a new method of philosophic inquiry. The first of these he accomplished in his treatise on the Advancement of Learning; the latter in the *Novum Organum*. The first of these, we regard as presenting even now, by far the best view to be found, of the various objects of human pursuit. With a comprehensiveness of mind, which shows that he had looked at all the inquiries of the illustrious men of other times, at their successes, and their failures, at the true compass of the field of inquiry, and at its actual results, he states what *are* the proper objects of human pursuit; what advances had been made; and what remained yet to be accomplished. It is lamentable, in looking at this work, to see how little had been accomplished by the toils of so many centuries, and no survey could more completely have shown the necessity of some *new* mode of investigation. Men had speculated and framed visionary theories age after age, and yet scarcely a truth in the science of astronomy had been established; and few of the facts of the universe had been subjected to the test of the inductive philosophy. Men had been so bewildered in the pursuit of substantial forms, and real essences, they had been so tossed in vortices, and had listened so anxiously to the imagined music of the spheres; they had so loved the great maxim of the Aristotelian philosophy, that the way to investigate truth is to frame a theory, and construct a syllogism; that science, even down to the time of Bacon, was a vast chaos, and the entire field was to be re-surveyed, and subjected to a better and different test.

This test he proposed in the *Novum Organum*. Never was there a more comprehensive maxim, or one more fitted to revolutionize all the prevalent systems of philosophy—though to us perfectly simple and obvious—than the first sentence of this wonderful work. Never was there an announcement more fitted to arrest the thoughts of a philosophic mind, or to produce a pause in all the inquiries that the world was then making, than when he proclaimed, "*Homo, naturæ minister et interpres, tantum facit et intelligit, quantum de naturæ ordine, re vel mente observaverit; nec amplius scit, aut potest.*" It is not our purpose to attempt an analysis of this vast and comprehensive work. It is perhaps of all works, except Butler's *Analogy*, least capable of abridgment. Our regret is that it is so little known and so little understood by theologians. Its great principles are better understood in all other departments of inquiry than in theology. We were about to add that divinity is almost the only science on which it has not cast a flood of light. We shall have occasion hereafter to call the attention of our readers to what we conceive would be the effect of an unsparing application

of its principles to theology. Our object in this article will be accomplished, if we can direct the attention of our readers to this great work.

The great principle of the Baconian or inductive philosophy, we have already stated in the advice given by Tycho Brahe to Kepler. It consists in a careful and patient examination of *facts*, or the phenomena of the universe, and deriving from the observation of those facts the principles of a just philosophy, or the laws by which the natural universe is governed. It supposes that God acts on the same principles in the same circumstances, in all places and at all times; and that when we have carefully examined one phenomenon, and have ascertained its cause, we are qualified and authorized to apply the same explanation to all similar facts in the universe. Till then, we are not qualified to frame a theory. Till then, a theory would be visionary, useless, wild, and probably erroneous. On this simple precept the whole of the Baconian philosophy rests, and the wonder to us is, that so much time was necessary in the history of philosophy to bring it out, and that the talents of such a man as Bacon were demanded to establish it on an imperishable foundation. Yet it was long before the world saw its value; and to the mistakes and errors of mankind in regard to this single principle, we are indebted for that stupendous production of the human mind—the *Novum Organum*.

It was sufficient honor for one man to have laid the foundation of the inductive philosophy; in other words, to have taught the race in what way to approach the works of God with the hope of success. This was the honor reserved for Bacon. Hence we are not to expect that he himself would make great advances in experimental philosophy. His discoveries were few, and many of his experiments incomplete. Yet it is amazing that he subjected so many objects to the test of experiment—that with so incomplete and clumsy an apparatus as could be possessed in his time, he attempted an examination of so many phenomena, and even with so much success.

From the time, however, of the publication of the *Novum Organum*, the progress of the sciences is well known. As if by the wand of magic, Bacon laid open for correct human investigation all the departments of the material and mental worlds. Galileo had already pointed the telescope to the heavens; and by a single glance had exposed to contempt all the cycles and conjectures of the ancient astronomy. Bacon taught mankind how to look at the stupendous facts which the telescope laid open to view; how to classify and arrange the amazing phenomena which now burst upon the eyes of mankind; how to subject nature to the torture, and how to penetrate into all elements, look at all worlds, and how to listen to the

universal voice which the heavens and the earth, the air, the ocean, and the land, were ready with a harmony more grateful than the feeble music of the spheres, to pour on the human ear in relation to science. Europe was prepared to follow her illustrious guide. Centuries had been opening the way for the *Novum Organum*; and it was impossible but that the boundaries of human science should at once be enlarged, far, far beyond what the world had ever known. A mighty engine was brought to bear on the works of creation; and never before had man been armed with like power in questioning the elements of the universe. We regard the rise of such a man as Newton, who has by common consent been placed at the head of the race, as an event which the crisis of the world was just fitted to produce. A peculiar juncture of political affairs has commonly raised up men adapted to their times. Such men as Cæsar and Napoleon, as Hannibal and Scipio, as Leonidas and our own Washington, are formed often by great *crises* in the history of the world. The frame of things makes their existence indispensable; and calls out talent, prowess, and patriotism, which, *but* for such events, would have slumbered unknown.

Newton we regard as indebted to the state of things formed by Wickliffe and Luther; by Galileo, Kepler, Brahe; by John of Salisbury, Roger Bacon, Ludovicus Vives; by Gilbert, who had investigated the laws of magnetic attraction; by Copernicus who had revived the ancient Pythagorean doctrine of astronomy; by Francis Bacon; and by the prevalence of just principles of philosophy in Europe, for the station which he occupies in fame as at the head of mankind. The development of some such mind, we consider as inevitable in the progress of events, as the formation of the character of Napoleon, fitted to control the whirlwind and direct the storm of revolution in France. And while we wish to concede all honor to his immortal name, we cannot but remark that under other auspices, Aristotle, or even John Duns Scotus, might have filled the space which Newton's name now fills; and that most certainly some La Place, or Herschell, would have opened the eyes of mankind on the modern astonishing theories of the heavens. In less than half a century from the publication of the *Novum Organum*, Newton had developed the laws of light, strictly on the principles of the inductive philosophy; had invented the science of fluxions; had discovered and demonstrated the grand principles of the modern astronomy; and by one transcendent effort of intellect, had opened to human view the sublimest scenes which had ever appeared to mortal eyes; and while he *told* us of the amazing distances and magnitudes of the heavenly bodies, seemed almost to annihilate their distances, and made man feel for the first time that he was an inhabitant of the *universe*, and

bound by indissoluble ties to distant worlds. It would be easy to extend our remarks to the improvements in chemistry and the kindred sciences. Perhaps in no way would the benefit of the inductive philosophy appear more striking than on a comparison of the labors of Sir Humphry Davy, with the toils of the alchemists of the dark ages. With the simple, and to us very obvious, principles on which Davy proceeded in the construction of the safety lamp, it is now impossible to conjecture what the Arabian chimists would have produced. We can scarcely help pausing to contemplate what a different destiny *might* have awaited mankind, if those principles had been understood by the Mussulman. The followers of the impostor might then have been put in possession of the amazing mechanical powers and chymical processes, which now distinguish and adorn christian lands. Science would have returned perhaps to its native Egypt; have spread over Arabia; have traveled eastward to Persia, to Hindoostan, to China. The magnetic needle might have pointed the ships of Islam to the distant western world, and established the religion of the prophet here. Our streams might have been navigated, and our lands filled by the Mussulman; and the Tigris, and the Euphrates, and the Ganges, perhaps might have been the first to open their bosoms to bear the vessel navigated by steam. God designed doubtless, that these sciences should start up, and receive their form and consummation on christian soils; and we love to trace the wonderful means by which he has directed man in science and the mechanic arts, as he has in religion; thus shewing that the worlds of nature and of grace are under his control. Our limits forbid our following out the bearing of the principles of the inductive philosophy on the arts and sciences. To our mind there is nothing more interesting than to observe the amazing changes which the inductive method has made in the opinions, the philosophy, and the arts of mankind, and in the ultimate effect which we believe those principles will have in sending the gospel around the globe. Hand in hand with the christian religion, we believe that those arts and scientific results will yet encompass the world. Already we trace their influence in enlarging and liberalizing all the usual modes of thinking among men; in lessening the distances between nations; in rendering it easy to cross seas, and plains; in forming *neighborhoods* of what were remote districts; in producing sympathy and a rapid interchange of feeling, between the distant parts of republics and remote kingdoms; and in forming facilities for carrying the gospel around the globe. That these improvements have been made on christian ground, we regard as proof at once of the large and liberal influence of true christianity, and at the same time as evidence, that it is the *intention* of God that this religion should encompass the world. We

do not adduce this as a *proof* that the christian religion is true ; but we cannot but regard it as one of the vast array of circumstances that God has placed every where around the christian scheme, evincing that it is under his benignant care ; that all those great advances which tend to exalt and adorn human nature, tend also to the spread of the christian system ; and that such is the economy of things that no great advance can be made in true science which shall not contribute to strengthen and confirm the evidences of revelation ; no facility of communication be opened among mankind—no process of breaking down existing barriers, and annihilating prejudices, and of cementing man and man, of binding nations in one universal brotherhood, which shall not contribute to the spread of the christian scheme ; and no spread of christianity in its purity, which shall not also convey to benighted men letters, science, mechanic arts, and liberty. We discern here, we think, evidence, that the scheme has the temporal approbation of God ; and in the staid and motionless formality of China, in the corruption of Hindoostan, in the wretchedness of pagan islanders, and Africans, and in the dark features and bloody hands which are every where seen under the reign of Islam, we think we discern the frown of God on the schemes of religion which thus fetter and bind down the faculties of man, and which never *have been*, and never *can be*, connected with true science and the mechanic arts.

But one other topic remains, pertaining to the character of Bacon. We refer to his moral and religious character—unhappily the most difficult part of our inquiry. That dark shade which passed over his name, toward the close of his life, which hurled him degraded from the office he had so long and so earnestly sought, which led Pope to characterize him as the

“Wisest, greatest, meanest of mankind,”

has rendered it almost impossible to estimate his moral and religious character. To this sad period of Bacon’s life, his character, so far as we know, except as a man fond of display, and ambitious, was beyond reproach. In the offices which he held, and in his private deportment, he was never suspected of a want of integrity. Hume declares that he was not only the ornament of his age and nation, but also “beloved for the courteousness and humanity of his behavior.” It is natural for us to seek some palliation for Bacon’s great offense ; and happily there *were* circumstances, which while they by no means justify his crime, yet serve in some measure to modify its character, and render it much *less* base and ignominious than such an offense would be deemed in our times.

The parliament which was assembled by James in 1621, entered immediately into an investigation of the existing abuses of the nation.

Unhappily they found in this, their favorite employment, an ample field of labor. Abuses had crept into the government under James, which this vain monarch either *would* not believe could exist under his wise administration, or which he was unwilling to correct. The necessity of the case, however, compelled him to yield to a determined and inflexible house of commons. That house, he already saw, was disposed to apply an unsparing hand to all the abuses of the government, and even to most of the royal prerogatives. The necessity of the case compelled him to express his royal gratification with their labors, and to encourage them in their work. "I assure you," said he, "had I before heard these things complained of, I would have done the office of a just king, and out of parliament have punished them, as severely, and peradventure more, than you now intend to do."

Encouraged in this manner, and resolved to strike an effectual blow, they commenced their investigations respecting the character and deeds of the Lord Chancellor. Unhappily, here also they found an ample field for the work of reform. The result is well known. Charges of extensive bribery were brought against him. It was alledged that he had received money and other presents, to the amount of many thousand pounds, while causes in chancery were depending on his decision. As to these charges Bacon made a *general* acknowledgment of guilt. With this confession the parliament was wholly unsatisfied. Determined to humble the greatest man of their time, they demanded an explicit confession in *detail* of each act of corruption. Power they knew was in their hands. A weak, vain, and silly, though learned monarch, trembled before them. They had commenced a process which *could* terminate only in the fall of the reigning sovereign; and they resolved that the highest man in the realm should feel the weight of their power. Bacon made them an ingenuous, frank, full, and most mortifying confession of guilt, and bowed himself before the representatives of the people. He acknowledged his guilt in *twenty-eight* articles, specified the amount he had received, detailed as far as was then practicable, the circumstances, and left himself at the mercy of an indignant parliament. "For extenuation," says he, "I will use none concerning the matters themselves; only it may please your lordships, out of your nobleness, to cast your eyes of compassion upon my person and estate. I was never noted for an avaricious man; and the apostle saith that covetousness is the root of all evil. I hope also that your lordships do the rather find me in a state of grace; for that in all these particulars, there are few or none that are not almost two years old; whereas those that are in the habit of corruption do commonly wax worse; so that it hath pleased God to prepare me by precedent degrees of amend-

ment to my present penitency; and for my estate, it is so mean and poor, as my care is now chiefly to satisfy my debts." Being asked by a committee of the house of lords, whether this was his true and real confession, he used the following noble and touching language, "My lords, it is my act, my hand, my heart; I beseech your lordships to be merciful to a broken reed." The sentence for the crime we have already recorded.

We have no wish to justify these deeply humiliating and disgraceful crimes. We know not an instance in all history where we could weep over human weakness, as over the fall of this great man. It is one of the thousands of instances that every where meet us of human depravity—but if it fixes us in grief, and appals the soul, it shows us man scarcely "less than archangel ruined," and arrests our thoughts not like the obscuration of a planet, or the withdrawal of the beams of a twinkling star, but with the deep melancholy which is shed over created things, when the sun

"In dim eclipse disastrous twilight sheds
O'er half the nations, and with fear of change
Perplexes monarchs."

The only way in which this offense can be in any manner palliated, is by a detail of the acknowledged circumstances of the case. 1. Bacon was distinguished for want of economy during his whole life. It is clear, as he says, that he was not "an avaricious man," but his great error was a love of office and honor; his great foible a fondness for display. This fondness had involved him in debts which he was unable to pay. 2. The affairs of his domestic economy, it appears, he entrusted to servants, who were regardless of expense, and probably unconcerned about the dignity, virtue, or solvency of their master. One article of the charge against him was, that "the lord chancellor hath given way to great exactions by his servants." To this he replies, "I confess it was a great fault of neglect in me, that I looked no better to my servants." 3. It is indisputable that Bacon was not *enriched* by these bribes. 4. It is more than probable, that Bacon only followed a custom which until that time had been regarded as no violation of the oath of the lord chancellor. Hume affirms that "it had been usual for former chancellors to take presents." If this was the case, it lessens greatly the enormity of the crime. It also casts much light on the character of the parliament which was thus resolved to make him a victim. 5. It is said that the presents which Bacon received did in no instance influence his decisions. It was never alledged, even by parliament, that he had given an unjust or erroneous sentence. None of his decisions were ever reversed; and it is affirmed that he "had given just decrees against those very persons from whom

he had received the wages of iniquity.”* It is further to be remarked, that of the twenty-eight charges of corruption against Bacon, but *seven* occurred during the existence of the suit. It remains yet to be demonstrated—a thing which *he* did not acknowledge, and which neither the witnesses in the case, nor the nature of his decisions proved, that even those *presents* influenced in the least his decisions. The more we contemplate the case of Bacon, the more we are disposed to think that injustice has been done to his character. We believe, in relation to the errors and failings of the men of those times—of such men as Calvin, and Cranmer, and Luther, and Bacon, that men have pronounced sentence with a severity drawn rather from the present views of morals, than from the sober estimate which we *ought* to make, if thrown into the circumstances of their times. This we think particularly true with regard to the crime of Bacon. While we feel assuredly, that crimes such as those with which he was charged, deserve the abhorrence of mankind, and go to impair and destroy all justice in the administration of laws, we are still inclined to look upon the errors of that age, and in those circumstances, with less severity than we should be disposed to apply in the more enlightened periods of the world. It is not easy to form an estimate of Bacon’s *religious* character. We are favored with so few and imperfect details of his private habits; we have so little that tells us the true biography of the man—his feelings, his usual deportment, his private modes of action; we are let so little into the interior arrangements of his life, that we cannot easily pronounce on his personal character. Charity would lead us to hope, notwithstanding his fondness for preferment, and the great error of his life, that he may have exemplified in his private life, the principles which he has so ably and so constantly inculcated. On the subject of his religious *opinions* he has left us no room to doubt. There is scarcely to be found in any language or in any writer, so constant a reference to the great religious interests of man, as in the writings of Bacon. There is no where to be found a more profound deference to the authority of the bible. There is perhaps no where more caution displayed, lest the profoundness, variety, compass and originality of investigation, should lead the mind astray, than in his investigations. It was one of his recorded sentiments—one of the results of his investigations, which he has expressed without hesitancy or qualification, “that a little philosophy inclineth a man to atheism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men’s minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second

* Hume.

causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them and go no further ; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity.”* His belief he has left us in a well written confession of his faith, embracing the usual articles of the christian religion. His prayers, which are preserved, breathe a spirit of true devotion, in a style and form which are not surpassed by any compositions of that period, in our language. It would be easy to transcribe page after page of his recorded sentiments ; and we might trace at every step of his life, his profound deference for the theology of the bible.

We do not believe that the christian religion depends for its evidence on the suffrage of any one philosopher ; or on the bright constellation of names which have expressed their profound regard for the truths of revelation. Still a christian cannot but look with deep interest on the fact that such men as Bacon, and Boyle, and Newton, bowed their mighty intellects to the authority of revelation ; came and brought all the rich and varied treasures of their profound investigation, and laid them at the foot of the cross ; and spent their lives increasingly impressed with the belief that the God of nature is also the God of the bible. While we do not claim, that on their authority the scriptures should be accredited as the word of God, we *do* claim that they should be allowed to rebuke the flippancy of youthful and unfledged infidelity ; that they should be permitted to summon men to *inquire*, before they *pronounce* ; we claim that their authority is sufficient to call on the youthful skeptic to pause, and to suspect that *possibly* he may be wrong. When mighty minds like those, have left their recorded assent to the truths of the christian scheme, it is not too much to ask of minds of far less power, to sit down and inquire, at least, whether christianity may not have come from God. When Newton, after having surveyed world on world, and measured the heavens, and placed himself for profound inquiry at the head of mankind, sat down in the full maturity of his days, and passed the vigor of his life, and the serene evening of his honored age in the contemplation of the New Testament ; when Bacon, after having rescued science from the accumulated darkness and rubbish of two thousand years ; after having given lessons to all mankind about the just mode of investigating nature ; and after having traversed the circle of the sciences, and gained all that past generations had to teach, and having carried forward the inquiry far into nature, bowed at every step to the authority of the bible ; when Hale, learned in the law, not only believed christianity to be true, but

* Essays Civil and Moral.

adorned the christian profession by a most humble life; when Boerhave, perfectly acquainted with the human frame, and skilled in the healing art, sat with the simplicity of a child at the feet of Jesus Christ; when Locke gave the testimony of his powerful mind to the truth of the christian religion; when Davy, first of chimists, came on this subject, to the same results as the analyzer of light, the inventor of fluxions, and the demonstrator of the theory of gravitation; as the author of the *Novum Organum*; and the writer of the treatise on the Human Understanding; when each science has thus contributed its founder, its ornament and its head, as a witness to the truth of the christian religion, it is not too much to conclude it may be something different from priestcraft and imposture. When we turn from these lights of men—these broad stars that spread their beams over all the firmament of science, and seek after the wandering and dim luminaries of infidelity, when we make a sober estimate of what the high priests of unbelief have done for the advancement of science, and the welfare of man, we are struck with the prodigious advance we have made into chilly and tenebrated regions. We have passed amid spirits of another order. We wander in climes as remote almost from science, as from christianity. We should know where we are as readily by their superficial, but pompous pretensions; by dark, but most confident scientific claims; by erroneous, wandering, but most flippant demands in science, as we do by their infuriated and bitter raging against the claims of the christian religion. Who are these men? Volney, Diderot, D'Alembert, Voltaire, Paine; Herbert—the best and greatest of them—Shaftsbury, Tindal, Morgan, Bolingbroke, Gibbon, Hume. What have they ever done for science? What advances have they ever made? So far as we know, not one of them has any pretensions to what gives immortality to the names of Boyle, Locke, Newton, Bacon, Hale. What valuable fact have they ever presented in science? What new principle have they originated, or illustrated? What department of science have they adorned? Not a man of them has ever trod the regions that constituted the glory of England, and of the world—the regions of profound science; of deep and penetrating investigation of the works of nature. In spite of such men, science would still have slumbered in the regions of eternal night; and infidelity, but for christian men, might have swayed a scepter as she desired, over regions of profound and boundless shades of ignorance and crime. We are accustomed to care little for names and authorities in religion. We believe that religion natural and revealed, accords with the constitution and course of nature. We believe that it is sustained by a force and compass of argument that can be adduced for the truth of no science. On the ground of the independent and impregnable proof of revealed religion, we are christians. But

there *are* men who pride themselves on names. There are those whose only reason for an opinion is, that it was held by some illustrious man. None are really so much under the influence of this feeling as the infidel. That *Hume* was a skeptic; that *Gibbon* was capable of a sneer; that *Paine* was a scoffer; that *Volney* was an atheist, is to them strong as proof of holy writ. Hence they feel that to doubt, is the most exalted state of man; that there is argument enough for mortals in a sneer and a jibe; that scoffing becomes a human being; and that to come to the conclusion that man has no Father and no God, that he dies like kindred worms, is the supremacy of felicity, and the perfection of reason. When *such* have been the apostles and high priests of unbelief—such the hosts which they have mustered, we feel that apart from all *argument* in the case, we would rather accord with the sentiments of the great luminaries of mankind in science; and that it is not unworthy of reason and elevated thought to suppose, that *true* religion may be found where we have found every other valuable blessing for mankind; and that the system, attended every where with science, refinement, and art, and that has shed light on the intellect, and honor on the names of Locke, and Boyle, and Bacon, is the system with which God *intended to bless men*.

ART. III.—ENCOURAGEMENT FOR THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.

Memoirs and Select Remains of an only Son; by THOMAS DURANT, Poole, Dorset, England.

Memoirs of Nathan W. Dickerman, who died at Boston, January 1830, in the eighth year of his age.

Memoirs of John Mooney Mead, who died at East Hartford, April 1831, aged nearly five years.

THE christian, and especially the christian parent, must, we think, contemplate the grounds on which he may justly be encouraged to hope for success, in well directed efforts to bring the young mind under the appropriate influence of christian discipline, with the liveliest interest and the most substantial benefit. To these grounds of encouragement, it is our wish at this time, to invite the attention of our readers. On this subject, which in one form or another has so often awakened the feelings, engrossed the thoughts, and commanded the pens of powerful writers, we dare not promise to enrich their minds with any new views, or to animate and refresh their hearts with any new motives. But something we may hope to do. A fresh influence we may hope to give to motives, which were long ago welcomed to their hearts, while we again invite their attention to views, which are more or less familiar to all.

The structure of the human mind, when compared with the demands of the divine law, will, we believe, convince any careful observer, that man was made for the service of God. Something in the human constitution, he will find, manifestly answering to every requisition, which is brought by the authority of heaven to bear upon it. Every man is evidently *capable* of the views, which he is bound to adopt and maintain, of the affections which he is bound to admit and cherish, of the habits which he is bound to form and exhibit. Nor is this all: he actually puts forth in *some* form, those very affections, which if properly directed, would constitute him a virtuous man. Love, confidence, desire to please,—the natural result of his appropriate powers,—all will admit, are the very sentiments, which in some form or other, he ought to maintain.

In the human constitution, moreover, is found a tendency to action, which cannot fail to bring its powers into exercise. This tendency consists in the *desire of happiness*, which glows in every bosom. Under the impulse of this desire, every human being looks around him for what he may regard as *substantial good*; for what may invite his confidence and attract his love; for what may meet his wants and refresh his spirits, as his chosen and appropriated portion. On first opening his eyes upon the world, he will as certainly “feel after” some object on which “he may lean his soul,” as the young vine will stretch its tendrils to find the sustaining branch to which it may adhere. Thus, he not only has those powers and susceptibilities, which furnish ground for the obligations that bind him to the throne of God; but has also, wrought into the elements of his nature, tendencies which constrain him to give full play to those susceptibilities and powers.

It is a fundamental doctrine of the bible, however, that the earliest movements of the human heart are of a *bad moral character*. Of the truth of this distressing fact, we have irresistible evidence; and we are of the number who regard it as a sacred duty, to urge on the minds of all, that “by nature” there dwells in us, as moral agents, nothing good; that whatever belongs to our moral character, unaffected by the transforming influences of the Holy Spirit, is sinful.

In the first exercise of his moral powers, every human creature fastens his affections on objects which cannot fail to mock his confidence and corrupt his heart. To resist the evidence which supports this fact, betrays, in our view, as gross stupidity, as to deny that every member of the human family is hastening to the grave. What pious parent, as he marked the earliest movements of his children, has not felt the evidence that they are sinful, come home to his heart like the point of a dagger! But the young affections, however they may be misplaced, are still awed by the voice of conscience. The heart trembles under merited rebukes.

It deeply feels the shocks which disappointed hopes occasion. It is ashamed of the toys which engross the affections, and is often half resolved to throw them away. Tortured by a thousand disappointments, the pining spirit cannot fail, amidst its blasted hopes, either to seek relief by giving itself up to the gratification of the animal, to which it is wedded ; or guided by an invisible hand, to rise in quest of rest and joy in the God whom it was made to love and serve. Now why should not the christian teacher take full advantage of these known tendencies of the human constitution ? Why should he not conduct the restless spirit into the presence of immaculate and eternal beauty ; in the hope, that under the dispensation of the Spirit, it may be smitten and subdued by the attraction of divine excellence ? Why should he not do his utmost to detain it amidst the deep calm raptures, and thrilling songs of paradise, in the hope, that under the dispensation of the Spirit, it may be led there, to lay up its treasures and fix its affections ? We say, *under the dispensation of the Spirit*, for we cannot hesitate to pronounce him ignorant of the simplest elements of christian truth, who does not find himself constrained in his efforts of love, to act upon the full conviction, that without divine influence the human heart will remain dead to the strongest attractions which heaven may present.

In our apprehension, the tendencies on which we have been dwelling, may in the work of christian education be appealed to, with far higher hopes of success in the young heart, than in the heart which has often been bewitched and debauched by worldly attachments. It is difficult indeed, to subdue the clinging attachment of the wayward vine to the bruised reed, which it may have embraced ; and to teach it to depend on a more substantial support. It is hard to awaken in the callous bosom of the worn out debauchee, a relish for the sober charms of domestic life. And can it be less difficult, to divorce the heart from those objects in which it has long sought forbidden joy, and to which it is fastened by a thousand entangling associations ? The rebukes of conscience, the pleadings of the heart, and the awful voice of God, have been long and madly disregarded. The world has been deified. God has been rudely thrust from the scenes of his own creation. His compassion and his anger, his condescension and his majesty have, alike been scorned. The human animal has been permitted insolently to tread upon the human spirit. The soul has been bartered away for gratifications which a beast would disdain to covet. The voice of experience is choked and lost, amidst surrounding smoke and incessant din. Such are the habits of every devoted worldling. They cannot fail to produce in the minds of every benevolent beholder, mingled and conflicting

sentiments ; lively apprehensions, deep disgust, blank horror, tender concern, and strong compassion. And can the christian parent endure the thought of seeing his child grow up the slave of sense? Must he not turn away in agony from the process, in which the fibres of the heart are twining about the world? Will not every hour in which his child may delay to fix his heart and hopes on heaven, be like the continuance of a drought, withering with a touch, more and more deadly, his fondest, dearest hopes? Will he not feel impelled, by motives which he cannot resist, almost to force his child into the arms of his Savior? Will he not intreat him with tearful earnestness, to fasten his affections, young and fresh, on the objects to which they appropriately belong; to seek and find his happiness in the eternal God, whom he was made to love and enjoy?

In his relations to those around him, which the little child first practically recognizes, we perceive a deep source of encouragement to parents in their delightful work, as christian teachers. Among the earliest sentiments, which pervade his heart, may be recorded a *sense of dependence*. He is constantly alive to his helplessness. Without the encouragement and aid of others, he trembles at the thought of making any movement. He naturally lifts up his eyes and stretches out his hand for assistance. How closely does he cling to his parents, and how difficult do they not find the task of bringing him to rely upon his own resources, so far as to take a single step? He naturally *confides*, moreover, in those on whom he is dependent. The benefits which he can ask only with the pleading eye, he expects will be kindly granted. His young heart does not admit the thought, that his parents can forget, or neglect, or injure him. In the face of frightful danger, he is not afraid to commit himself to their protection. The threatening storm makes him cling more closely to their bosom. In whatever way they may have raised expectation in him, he does not hesitate to rely on the engagement. He readily gives them full credit for every kind intention. He gives up his heart to them in *filial love*. If they are absent, he mourns and pines; when they return, he greets them with a most cordial welcome; he clings to their side and rejoices in their society. He sees a thousand attractions in them. Their spirit, movements, and designs, command his admiration. Their very imperfections he regards with a partial eye. Among all the objects which attract his attention, and interest his feelings, he knows nothing which has so strong a hold upon his heart as his parents.

It deserves to be mentioned here, that little children are subject to frequent *changes of mind*. The views which they have of the objects around them, become daily more clear, accurate, and

comprehensive. To be adjusted to these views, their conclusions, feelings, movements, need frequent alteration. A change of views becomes, not unfrequently, a source of deep regret. How often do their hearts bleed under the "rod of correction!" How often do their mistakes and faults cover them with shame and constrain them to "walk softly before" their parents.

Between the relations and circumstances which give birth to the feelings we have just dwelt upon, and the relations and circumstances, which are the known occasion of christian sentiments and habits, a marked and striking analogy obtains. Our relations to God demand of us a deep and constant sense of our dependence upon him, a tender and lively confidence in him, and attachment to him, strong and fervent. The sentiments, thus required, are the very elements of christian character. The repentance, moreover, which is enjoined on every man, consists in a change of views, and feelings, and habits; and in a word, all the elements of christian character are manifestly analogous to states of mind, with which every child must be more or less familiar. The affections, which in the domestic circle he daily exercises, if directed towards the objects presented in religion, would make him a christian. Parents, then, may turn the relations and circumstances with which the child is most familiar, to high account in the work of christian education. To explain and enforce his religious obligations, they may appeal directly to feelings, of which he cannot but be daily conscious. Look up to God, they may say, with that sense of dependence on him, which makes you lean upon our arm, and cling to our side. In view of your errors and your sins, let your repentings be "kindled together," as in view of your mistakes and faults towards us, you have often with bitter regret, changed your feelings and your purposes. Be as quick to feel the attractions of his beauty, to love him with all your heart, as to regard us with the eye of filial fondness.

The success of such appeals, under God, must be greatly affected by the character of the circle with which the child is connected. If the spirit and habits prevalent there, are of a worldly stamp, the attachment which binds the young heart to parents and friends, must operate to prevent any aspirations after God and heaven. Between worldly minded parents and a holy God, the smallest child cannot but see a frightful contrast. The fondness with which he loves the former, cannot but work a strong aversion in him to the latter. Thus, what was designed in the arrangements of providence to be a precious and powerful aid in christian education, becomes a distressing hindrance.

The child who is so blessed as to belong to a domestic circle which is animated by the spirit, and dignified with the image

of the Savior, has in his domestic attachments, an influence in the highest degree friendly to a life of christian piety. The parents whom he loves, breathe the temper and walk in the footsteps of Jesus Christ. The character of the Savior is more or less fully and clearly embodied in theirs. Every feature is more or less evidently and attractively reflected from their countenances. It is their glory to be "like him." When filial piety fastens on such an object, it fixes on a point at no great distance from the Savior. In such a case, the stronger the attachment, the more powerful may be the influence to induce the love of God. How great an advantage in the work of christian education, to have a heart to act upon, which clings with warm attachment to a holy parent! Thrice happy day, when this advantage shall be offered and enjoyed in every household!

Before we dwell upon the encouragements which parents have, as christian teachers, to prosecute their work with vigor and with hope, *in the success with which God has crowned such exertions*, we may be expected to touch upon what we have sometimes feared, is a popular objection to the doctrine we are advancing. "*Ministers' sons*," it is often coarsely said, "*are worse than other people's*." We rejoice to know, that facts furnish but a slight foundation for this bitter reproach. We are compelled, with aching hearts, to admit what none but a fiend could hear with triumph, that instances of deep depravity—nay, of shocking profligacy—may sometimes be found in the families of ministers. But these are rare exceptions to a general rule. They can never be fairly arrayed as an objection against the doctrine, of which we are the advocates. Ministers, it must not be forgotten, are sometimes unsound at heart. Bound by obligations the most weighty and sacred, they still live in disobedience to the divine commands. A decent exterior they must maintain in the eyes of the world; but in the retired walks of life, they may cherish a temper and maintain habits directly at war with their official character. With whatever success they can conceal themselves from others, from their *own children* the real tendency of their conduct, cannot be concealed. *They* live too near a parent's bosom, to be kept from looking in upon the heart which beats there. With his true character they will form a certain and familiar acquaintance. *And his true character will work whatever impression he may make upon their spirit.*

But in the case of ministers of a far different character, there are frequently two things, which cannot but have, in respect to their sons, an unfavorable bearing on the results of their education. *They are excluded chiefly from the immediate society of their father, and often pass their early years without any regular and*

constant employment. To furnish this employment, any one can see, for reasons which we need not give; must often be very difficult. At home they have little or nothing to do; abroad they are exposed to untoward influences, without the advantage of those guards and checks which are commonly secured by regular indentures. Thus they are exposed to the mischief of cherished and habitual idleness. In the meantime, their sympathy with their father may in a great measure be cut off. While engaged with his books, he may be impatient of interruption. He may feel himself unable to endure the embarrassment which their presence "in the study" might occasion. He may thus hold them at arm's length. Chilled by the distance at which they are removed from their father, they may seek and find other familiar acquaintance and confidential friends. In choosing these, they may be ill-advised and unhappy. Influences may be exerted upon them, which may be developed in their character and prospects. Let every minister then beware of regarding his study or his closet, as too sacred for the approach and presence of his children. Let him welcome them at the tenderest age to this consecrated retreat. Let him encourage them to come often and stay long. Let him take more or less the conduct of their education. Let him see to it, that his sympathies and theirs in full current flow onward together in an unobstructed channel. It is, we think, a poor pretense that his public duties are too important and too pressing to permit him to care for the offspring of his body. *He* has no right to children, who has no time nor heart to make provision for their welfare. We believe that every minister may labor according to a plan, which will enable him to meet at the same time his official responsibilities, and the intellectual and spiritual wants of his household. We advise young ministers, especially, to keep clear of the prejudice, that to study with any good effect, they must be in solitude and silence. If they care for the children, who are growing up around them, let them learn to think amidst the most active scenes of domestic life.

While these facts will account for the occasional profligacy of ministers' sons, a strict inquiry, we believe, will show that instances of this kind are extremely rare, when compared with the whole number of the descendants of clergymen in this country. We remember once to have made an induction of particulars, in the circle with which we were most thoroughly conversant, and to have been greatly delighted with the results. In this circle the children of ministers, with very few exceptions, were distinguished for their excellence and usefulness. These exceptions, however, strike the mind forcibly, and fill a large place in the public eye. In the house of a minister, the noisy profligacy of one unworthy

child, will attract more attention and move more tongues than the meek virtue, the unostentatious piety, the unobtrusive worth, the silent usefulness of the many, who do honor to the sacred relations they sustain! May not hundreds know, that one of the greatest divines of our country had one unworthy son, who have never heard or cared to learn what numbers from generation to generation, trace their origin to him, who in various stations of usefulness have shed a clear lustre on his memory?

If any of those who are engaged in sustaining and promoting sabbath schools, need encouragement in their good work, we would invite their attention to the "*Memoirs of Nathan W. Dickerman.*" In him, they will rejoice to find an attractive illustration of the happy tendency of their disinterested labors. Let them fix their eye on "the gentleman," who when Nathan "was about five years old," "called upon his mother, and requested her to send her son" to the sabbath school. Perhaps he hesitated to enter her dwelling to make this request. Might he not be regarded as obtrusive? Might he not be chilled with a frown? The request, however, is made and cheerfully complied with. Nathan enters the sabbath school, and through the sabbath school, the house of God. What he sees and hears takes fast hold of his attention. His heart is affected. One morning he rises early, and goes to his mother's bedside. He touches her elbow. She awakes, and finds him in tears. "Mother," he demands, and O what a question for a maternal heart to answer; "where shall I kneel to pray for a new heart?" A little more than a year, Nathan enjoys the privileges of the sabbath school. He is now seized with a dreadful malady. He is not unfrequently found in tears with the thrilling words upon his lips; "I don't think I shall ever get well, and I want a new heart." Having been enabled "to lean his weary soul" upon the Savior, he longs to be baptized into His adored name. To the objection—alas, that any heart should harbor such a prejudice—that he was *too young*, he artlessly replied, "but Jesus said, suffer little children to come to me, and forbid them not." The desire of his heart is at length gratified; and Nathan is permitted to celebrate the dying love of the Redeemer at the sacramental table. With what emotions did this renewed child ever remember W. P. who first asked his mother to send him to the sabbath school. Resting once in the arms of a devoted friend, he opened his eyes, which had been closed in apparent devotion, and looking upward, said, "*I think the Lord will bless Mr. P. very much; because he was the first one that asked whether I might go to the sabbath school.*" Let any one engaged in the labors of the sabbath school, put himself in the place of Mr. P.; let him mark the deep penitence,

the living faith; the warm charity; the sweet submission; the enrapturing hopes of this dear child under the protracted pressure of excruciating pain, and amidst the agonies of death; and then say, as he marked his upward flight, in what estimation would he hold the dying blessing of this young christian? Would he not think himself richly rewarded for whatever effort or self-denial he had encountered, in sustaining the interests of the sabbath school? And would he not resolve to do more to advance this holy cause, than he had yet attempted? Whoever he may be, we cannot hesitate to assure him, that he is justly entitled to the full weight of the encouragement which multiplied instances of usefulness in sabbath schools, more or less like that presented in the Memoirs of Nathan W. Dickerman, can afford.

From the sabbath school teacher, we turn to the christian parent. His attention we would call to the striking illustrations of the doctrine advanced in this article, which are to be found in such books as *Durant's Memoir of an Only Son*, and the *Memoir of John M. Mead*. He cannot fail to be interested in marking the feelings, with which these parents received their children to their bosom. "It was no sooner announced to me," writes Mr. Durant, "that a man-child was born into the world, than I most solemnly dedicated him to his Maker." The consecration of their child to God, in whose name he was baptized, formed the basis of the discipline, which they employed for his benefit. They never seemed to have lost sight of their obligations to train him up to serve and enjoy the Savior. As they could not throw off the responsibilities of parents, they resolved as far as possible, *themselves* to conduct the education of their children. "They entrusted John," writes Mr. Mead, "very little to others." From his parents he derived his first impressions, with them he early learned to sympathize, to them he dedicated the warm affections of his heart, he received from them the richest lessons of instruction. They were thus enabled "to grapple their son to them as with hooks of steel;" and to make his affectionate regard for them greatly subservient to his religious interests.

We do not pretend that every parent can, to the same extent as Mr. D., conduct himself the education of his children. But may not every parent cherish the *spirit* of his example? May he not obtain just views of the proper object and best measures of intellectual and moral discipline? May he not keep his heart continually alive and his eyes continually open to the training, which his children are receiving? With ever watchful attention, may he not mark the operations of their minds and the movements of their hearts? May he not be every day contributing something

directly or indirectly, to their advancement in "whatsoever are lovely and of good report?" May he not thus keep fast hold of them, and do much to form and perfect their character?

We dare not trust our pen with the delightful task of giving in detail the method pursued by their parents, in the education of William F. Durant and John M. Mead; nor with the equally delightful task of describing at length the golden results, in which both parents and children rejoiced. Such a task would require more time and space, than could fairly be allowed us. The memoirs, in which the interesting details to which we allude, are embodied, we cordially and earnestly recommend to the careful perusal of every conscientious parent. He will be delighted to find here a plan of education described and pursued, which he cannot but pronounce happily conformed to the christian model. In the general outline and in the minor features, he will perceive that a constant and affectionate regard is had to the peculiarities of the gospel. The tendencies of such a discipline, he will see clearly illustrated and greatly honored by the practical results, which are preserved in the history of these cherished sons. The temper they breathed, and the course they pursued, living and dying, he will regard as a high encouragement to subject his own children with equal solicitude and hope, to the same discipline.

As He places the helpless infant in the arms of the exulting parent, we seem to hear the Savior say; Take this little one and "train him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Engage in the work of education, not only with solicitude and diligence, but also with courage and hope. Remember, that I have formed that infant with a constitution adapted to my service, and breathed into him desires, which the friendship of his Savior alone can satisfy. In the relations under which I have placed him, see the occasions, in which he cannot but exercise sentiments, obviously and strongly analogous to the elements of religion. With an eye open on the history of the church, weigh the golden results, with which, under the dispensation of the spirit, christian discipline has been crowned in the solid worth, extensive usefulness, and permanent happiness of those children, for whose benefit it has been employed. Lay hold of these encouragements, so appropriate and weighty; and cheerfully assume the responsibilities of the sacred trust, with which you are now honored.' What parent, as he presses his infant to his bosom, will not welcome such gracious words to his heart!

ART. IV.—MEMOIR OF REV. SUTHERLAND DOUGLAS.

SUTHERLAND DOUGLAS, a servant of Christ, and a minister of the gospel, died two years ago in England. He had traveled for his health in several countries of the eastern continent, and was on the eve of returning to the United States, and to the ministry which engaged all his affections. His friends and family were expecting soon to welcome his restoration to them and to the church, when suddenly his departure from this world was announced. Before the day had arrived when they thought of him as embarked on the ocean, his entrance had been made, as they now feel assured, into the joys of his Lord. But he has left a precious legacy behind him,—his example, his labors, and the “memory of the just.”

Of the present memoir the object is, not alone, nor chiefly, to indulge the wish which is prompted by the affection and grief of a circle of numerous friends—that of seeing their recollections of departed worth embodied in some enduring form. The subject of this narrative was a follower of the Lamb; and our desire is that men may imitate his example in all things in which he imitated *Christ*. He was also one in whom the most attractive qualities of natural character were beautifully blended with the graces of a christian. May they hold the same relation in this memoir which they did in real life, and affect the reader as they did the beholder!

Much of what we are about to present, rests on the authority of personal knowledge—an intimate acquaintance co-extensive with the period which these memoirs embrace. The history is enriched, besides, by the reminiscences of friends. But more interesting than all of them, will be found the extracts from his Journal; which, written at intervals sometimes of days, and sometimes of months, is a record of his own mind. We shall see a youth, in a revival of religion, yielding the supreme affections of his heart to Christ, and transferring his designs, hopes, and motives, from the scale of time to that of eternity. We shall see him ever afterwards acting under an impression of the immeasurable capacities and worth of the soul; and fixing all the hopes of time on that ministry which calls back wanderers to their Shepherd and Bishop. Amidst the most interesting relations of life, through an education for the gospel ministry and short but faithful labors in it, in the failure of many hopes, in mingled griefs and rejoicings, and under the pressure of a resistless malady, we shall trace a “sinner saved by grace” ripening for glory.

Sutherland Douglas was born at Troy, N. Y., in the year

1804. His parents, who were members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, had trained him up with uncommon care; and at the early age of fourteen he was placed for the completion of his education at Yale College. Here he was noticed for a remarkably youthful air and size, a sweet expression of countenance, and mild and manly manners. Soon after he joined his class, young Douglas gave decisive indications of superior scholarship; though he seems to have labored but little beyond the allotted hours of study. In the retrospections of his Journal, the two first years of his college life, are looked back to as a period that was passed without any adequate conception of the preciousness of time, and the evening hours as spent in a manner worse than idle. In fact his course thus far, was beset by dangers, such as have impressed on many a young man's character lasting injury; since it brought him into close contact with some unworthy fellow-students, of whose frolics he was the amused spectator, though not a partner, that we know, in any thing disorderly—much less any thing corrupt. But, at the end of his second year all was changed; the thoughtless and worldly Sutherland was brought to “a sound mind,” and to a resolution, that “the time past of his life should suffice to have wrought the will of the flesh.”

In the latter part of the summer of 1820, an unusual sensation on religious subjects, was prevalent at New-Haven, and shortly after, in the college. Numbers of persons, with no common intercourse or communication, were impressed about the same time, with a deep solemnity, and felt the reality of divine truth in a way unknown before. The true disciples of Jesus found a new impulse added to their christian desires and hopes. Unconverted sinners in great numbers, were intently occupied with the inquiry “what shall I do to be saved?” By some these serious impressions were resisted, though ineffectually—by some resisted till they were gone; but, when not resisted to the end, in almost every case, peace sooner or later dawned upon the mind. Many date from this season their first knowledge of religion, as an active principle, their first satisfying hope, their first taste of solid happiness. This we need not say, was a REVIVAL OF RELIGION; known before and since, in places without number; but elsewhere unknown, and by numbers, in the very seat of them, exceedingly misunderstood. At this period are dated the first lines written in the Journal of young Douglas, which are interesting, as they show the gradations through which that dawn arose in a young christian's heart, which was destined to ‘shine more and more to the light of perfect day’.

My attention was turned to the concerns of religion on Thursday evening, the 17th of August 1820, through the means of the Rev. Mr. N——, who preach-

ed, that evening, in the theological chamber. I thought of the subject more and more every day until Saturday evening the 26th, when I heard Prof. G—— preach in the same chamber. He also delivered an affectionate address to those students who were seriously inclined, on Sunday evening. On Tuesday morning I conversed with him in private; and I then entertained a hope that I had obtained an interest in my Redeemer. On Saturday afternoon, the 2d of Sept. Dr. B—— delivered an address to some of the students, concerning the character of the true christian. This occasioned some doubt in my mind concerning my situation. Monday I felt doubtful and unhappy; in the evening I attended a monthly concert of prayer, in the theological chamber. (Tuesday 25th) Examination begins. There is in college too little seriousness. I retired to my room and spent the morning in self-examination and prayer; I read Doddridge, 13th to 17th chapters, on the "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul." I felt my own sinfulness and inability to do any thing of myself: I then cast myself at the feet of Jesus, and offered up the following prayer." * * * * *

His confession of sins and helplessness; his thankful acceptance of salvation by Christ; his covenant to be the Lord's, wholly and forever; his desire to be transformed into the image of God, are recorded and signed with his name. He prays that on his death-bed, he may remember the solemn transaction, and that God may remember it too; and that "if any surviving friend should, when I am in the dust, meet with this memorial of my solemn transaction with thee, he may make the engagement his own, and partake in all the blessings of thy covenant, through Jesus Christ."

One may reasonably suppose that this act of dedication was in his thoughts, when near his death in a lucid interval, he said, "This is not a time for a man to utter what is in the depths of his heart,—I made the Savior my trust in more suitable and more favorable times." A few passages that follow, exhibit his prevailing state of mind after conversion.

Sept. 11th.—Mr. F——, our tutor, delivered, this morning, a very affectionate farewell address to the division. He is very much beloved by all that know him, particularly by the members of his division. When I reflected that I had sometimes displeased my tutor, who had always endeavored to promote my welfare, the tears trickled down my cheeks.

Sunday, Nov. 5th.—This day I have enjoyed more than any other of this term. I hope to partake of the holy sacrament of our Lord's supper at the next celebration. I am still by far too much attached to the world and its vanities, too much disturbed by envy, ambition, pride, vanity and self-righteousness; but I am comforted by the thought that the Lord is merciful, and is not extreme to mark what is done amiss, that the truly penitent and believing will find forgiveness with him, and strength to overcome all the enemies of the soul.

Sunday, Dec. 31st.—On Christmas I first partook of the sacrament of the Lord's supper.—One half-hour, more and another year is gone forever. Solemn thought! a year fraught with events that will ever be remembered with pleasure; that have caused joy in heaven, and added to the number of those that sing the praises of the Lamb during the endless ages of eternity.—Heavenly Father! may the time past of my life suffice to have wrought the will of the flesh; and may I henceforth be entirely devoted to thy service,—abound in love and all the christian graces,—ever rely on the merits of Jesus for forgiveness—the Spirit for strength and comfort,—be more and more weaned from the world, prepared for eternity, and finally, in thine own appointed time, be received into thy heavenly kingdom for my Redeemer's sake. And to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, be ascribed all the glory forever. Amen.

During this period, the devotion of young Douglas to spiritual subjects, was very marked. He was to be met in the circles for social prayer, and the assemblies of christians for mutual encouragement in their heavenly race. His desire for the salvation of his companions was manifest in many a solemn, many a persuasive form of exhortation and example. As you saw him move along the paths of life, something brought up to mind at once a solemn and a childlike image. The serene look, the meditative walk, the gentle motion and accent, were all consonant to the idea of a heart, peaceful, chastened, elevated. To those who did not see him at that time, one cannot easily convey a full impression of the loveliness to which religion formed and tempered all his acts. The tenor of his life it turned to a sweet and placid solemnity. The observer could well have felt the truth of Hannah More's remark, that *happiness* is a *serious* thing.

It was at this time that a friend in college, who had long loved him, and been loved in return, met him, and gently asked why of late he had seemed to avoid him? Douglas told him all the truth—he loved indeed, but feared to cherish an *intimacy* with any one who did not love his Savior. To the same friend again, after divine truth had reached *him* too with its subduing efficacy, he wrote; and in a remarkable passage, too long to be copied here, told the aching of heart with which he once thought their companionship *in time*, must terminate without any security of their meeting in a higher existence in eternity. Thus was he ready to sacrifice even the heart's cherished affections, to what he judged to be his Lord's command.

At this time, sabbath schools and the collateral agencies for the spiritual benefit of the young, the ignorant, and friendless, were in their germ, when compared with their present state of maturity; and it is a fact worthy of record, that the piety of this young christian found for itself a path to good ends, almost untrodden at that time, but opened since in full, and likely to become beaten by the steps of many pious messengers, who shall go forth as city missionaries. He went out alone, in the suburbs of New-Haven, and in the dwellings of the ignorant and destitute, "to seek and to save them that were lost." Regardless of poverty or color, he sought out the spiritual and temporal wants of the destitute; and opened there the rich fountains of charity and gospel grace. There, amid rags, and rudeness, where hearts are bowed by sorrows that rarely find their way into the enclosures of abundance and mental cultivation, in the spirit of his master, he preached the gospel to the poor.

At the Junior exhibition, in May, 1821, he was selected to perform a prominent part. His subject was the "character of Hen-

ry Martyn." His public speaking, like his life, was calm and cheerfully serious; and it is well remembered how unusual an impression was carried to the minds of those who heard him, when, at the close, rapt in contemplation of the sacred fires which that pure and holy man may yet prove to have lighted up amid the darkness of Paganism, he repeated in a manner less of oratory than of prayer, the concluding quotation.

"Then shake the heavens, thou Mightiest, and descend,
While truth and peace thy radiant march attend :
With wearied hopes thy thousand empires groan,
Our aching eyes demand thy promised throne ;
Oh ! cheer the realms from life and sunshine far,
Oh ! plant in eastern skies thy seven-fold star."

The character which we are aiming to delineate, is one that was not liable to sudden fluctuations. It was marked by great evenness and uniformity both of feeling and action; and the changes to which it was actually subject, extended through periods of time, and advanced with slow steps. We find him in his *Journal*, often lamenting barren and sinful states of mind. His christian hopes were a subject of constant and anxious scrutiny; but to the hour of death, it is not known, that he ever questioned the reality of his interest in Christ's salvation, through all his sins, sorrows, trials, and fears. There was a period, commencing toward the close of his collegiate life, and ending we know not exactly when, during which, though he lived under the influence of genuine religious principle, he had lost, in some degree, the tender and sweet cast of piety with which his christian life began. In fact, near the close of the senior year, we find him engaged with a large part of his class, not indeed in resisting the faculty of the college, but in urging measures which they disapproved, in a spirit for which he afterwards expressed his deep regret. This is the only instance, and we have mentioned it in this light alone, in which his feelings are known to have betrayed him into open acts, which he was led afterwards to condemn.

Having graduated with the highest honors of the institution, at the commencement in 1822, he took up his residence for a time in New-Haven. His plan was ultimately to enter into the ministry of the Episcopal church, upon whose bosom his childhood had been cast, and towards whose ministrations he felt predisposed; but his present object was to give a wider scope to his intellect by the pursuit of general knowledge. During the winter his time was profitably spent in study, in social intercourse, and the indulgence of those generous affections which made him, in the families where his heart was laid open without restraint, the delight of every circle. In April of the following year, he left New-Haven in a depressed

state of mind; the result of incidents interesting in their private relations. In his Journal he speaks of laboring under "a calm and concealed grief—sometimes seeming to chill the heart with insensibility,—at others melting it to tenderness, and again causing it to ache with excess of emotion." The summer was passed at Troy, where his hours were given to study and reflection, and to a steady contemplation of the approaching duties and solemn account of the gospel ministry. Here, for a time, his health seemed to be worn upon by the strength of his feelings; but this excess of emotion he found it at last a duty to resist, and their ultimate effect was doubtless happy on his character and piety. Many reflections upon theological and practical subjects mix themselves in the journal of this period, with striking incidents and states of mind. Some passages will be transcribed,—not, in every case, the most spiritual that might be selected, but the best suited to the current of this history, and to a knowledge of their author's mode of thought and feeling. In the last extract it may possibly be wondered at, that a young man in his study should by himself conceive such enlarged, though simple views of doctrine.

July 2d.—That others should overrate my attainments—deeming me at all superior, for one of my age, as a scholar, makes me but feel my own ignorance. It was not until senior year that I became sensible of the value of time, and of the bearing of my studies upon future usefulness. Junior year had been the time of that mighty work of grace which prevailed throughout Connecticut. I was very fond of religious meetings, and probably too inattentive to the duties of a student. Had I more faithfully attended to my *closet duties* and studies, it might better have advanced my spiritual as well as intellectual improvement. * * * *

At the beginning of junior year I was perfectly ignorant of the *sectarian peculiarities* of doctrine: and I sincerely rejoice that I was so. Prejudiced by education in favor of no one class of sentiments, my mind was the more favorably disposed for the investigation of religious truth, and my constant effort has been to know *only the truth*,—to adopt opinions from weight of evidence and without regard to sect. Oh! that I might attain and ever pursue this, *the only safe* course, amid the labyrinths of error.—Next fall, at the age of nineteen, I am to enter on the preparatory studies of a profession,—and that the most sacred and responsible assigned to frail man. In view of the christian ministry, how deeply ought my heart to respond to the language of the sainted Martyn,—“What a *knowledge* of *man*, and acquaintance with the *scriptures*, what *communion* with *God* and study *of my own heart*, ought to prepare me for the awful work of a messenger from God, on the business of the soul.”

July 5th.—I was never so fond of study as this summer. I know not that I care much for distinction, or this world's praise; but the pursuit of knowledge seems more delightful in itself, and yet more valuable as a means of usefulness. This subject, however, like all others, assumes its true interest only in relation to eternity. * * * *

At the first moment of existence the mind enters upon a course which reaches through eternity.

It is formed for *continual* improvement—to be enriched with knowledge and strengthened by discipline,—to take more and more enlarged views,—to put forth an increasing energy upon the subjects of investigation, which the *universe* presents. The mere laying aside, at death, of its material form, can be attended with no pause in the progress of mind. That point, therefore, in the scale of *intellectual*, as well as moral improvement, which shall have been reached when we leave

the present state, is to be our *starting point for eternity*.—What a motive, here, to the most faithful improvement of means!

Aug. 1st.—I have sometimes been asked, “are you a Calvinist?”—If, to be a Calvinist, one must adopt every sentiment of that great reformer, I presume there are few such at the present day; for the human mind makes advances, from age to age; and surely theology, like every other science, is capable of improvement. As terms become more defined, one’s views upon every subject ought to become more clear and correct. To many, the term Calvinistic, is one at which they startle with contempt or horror. I have no doubt, that few who use it, have looked into the works of Calvin. From what I have read in them, I consider his views incorrect of the influence of Adam’s fall on his posterity,—or else his exhibition of those views not clear. And I might say the same of his remarks upon some other subjects; but some sentiments have been imputed to him which I cannot find. The ideas of “Christ’s dying only for his elect,” of any irresistible influence of the Spirit, and of mere caprice or partiality on the part of God, seem to me wholly foreign to his mind. He ascribes only a persuasive influence to the Holy Spirit—man’s destruction to his own voluntary persistence in sin.

After all I sincerely wish these terms, so odious, “Calvinistic,” “Arminian,” and others, were banished. It matters very little what Calvin thought, or any other man, or body of men. If the best examination we are capable of giving, convinces us a sentiment is incorrect, it is our’s to reject it; and to adopt our every opinion because we judge it true, not because it is a part of some favorite system. The bible only is infallible,—the sole authority in matters of religious belief.

To me man seems to stand in two distinct relations to God. The one is that of a free agent under his moral government; perfectly capable of performing his duty. Such was Adam; and such is every human being, at the present day, from the unknown period of his existence, when moral agency commences. Previously, I cannot conceive his having any moral character. Our circumstances are different from those of Adam; our native *powers* the same. Scripture states the simple fact, that every man, being thus situated, has chosen to transgress the law of God. His ruin were the necessary result, had not the Redeemer graciously died to save. All, having transgressed, are called upon simply to put full trust in Christ; and are perfectly capable of this act of faith: but the bible tells us that *no one*, left to himself, would choose to avail himself of this way of salvation,—and here God justly might leave all to perish with accumulated guilt. The only depravity of which I can conceive, is that of the *voluntary acts* of the soul. By total depravity I simply mean, that all the acts of every unconverted man, which have a moral character, are transgressions of the law of God.

I come now to man’s second relation to God; that of a subject of the influence of the Spirit.

The nature of this influence is doubtless persuasive, for the only way in which the human mind can be operated upon, is that of motives. We know not the mode of the Spirit’s operations: His office may be to present more powerful motives, or give greater efficacy to those already presented. This influence is perhaps exerted to a greater or less degree upon all men. At any rate, these operations involve no more interference with free agency than does the influence of one man over another, to convince and to persuade. But the bible teaches that God, for reasons known only to himself, but entirely consistent with his perfections, has chosen to save certain individuals of the human race; and only these does the Spirit incline to submission, to repentance, to faith in Christ, and to a life of holiness,—that the merits of their Savior may secure the forgiveness and acceptance of God, and an eternal residence in the mansions “prepared for them from the foundation of the world.” And this purpose, like every other of the immutable God, while it affects not the justice of the act, has existed from eternity. Those who perish, perish simply because they “*will not come to Christ that they may have life.*” And it may be, for aught we know, that a gracious God will have put forth every effort to save them too which he could, without infringing upon their free agency, or upon the perfections of his own character. Thus the salvation of every saint in heaven, will have been owing wholly to the merits of Christ, of which the Spirit alone will have inclined them to avail themselves. This is my view of the doctrine of “particular election;” a doctrine which, in

the highest degree, illustrates the sovereign grace and mercy of God, and the perverse rebellion of man,—while it is as perfectly consistent with free agency, in the latter, as any of the operations of divine Providence in accomplishing his eternal purposes."

At the end of October, 1823, Douglas left Troy for Andover, in Massachusetts, to begin his course of theological study. After much inquiry and balancing of opposite opinions, he had conceived a fixed desire to avail himself, one year at least, of the benefits of that noble institution. This determination, he feared, might give rise to a misapprehension of his motives, in the minds of many, and especially those of his own denomination. But apprehensions of this kind could not weigh against the hope of solid acquisitions; and the question of his sincere attachment to that denomination, he left to be decided by events, or to remain unsettled, if any finally should doubt it, on the ground either of that choice, or his free and friendly communion with pious persons of every name.

At Andover we find him exulting in the acquisition of important knowledge, delighted with the simple language of the Hebrews, and the clearness which a knowledge of it gives the sacred writings. His Journal at this period, and his letters, are not copious; and, for the most part, mark the progress of his thoughts and studies, his practical reflections, and occasionally, his solemn contemplations of eternal things. He has not failed to record the warm regard in which he held his instructors, the private conversation of some of whom he enjoyed and highly valued. His just principles of christian communion may be gathered from the following incidental paragraph.

January 4th, 1824.—This morning the Lord's supper was administered: It was a very interesting season of communion; and at dinner it was pleasing to see the brethren comparatively silent and thoughtful. Before church I had an interesting and candid discussion with brother G—, of our church, upon the propriety of Episcopalians' receiving the sacrament from ministers of other denominations. He accorded with me, chiefly, in sentiment. My reasons for it, and for receiving with open arms, sincere christians of whatever minor name, are very clear to me."

By acting openly upon the principle set forth in the preceding extract, the subject of this narrative had given offense to many of his own church, who could not agree with him. It was, in fact, a subject much contested in that church. Many went the length of asserting, that Christ never authorized a church out of Episcopal succession and organization; and that out of it, no man has a *promise* of salvation, though saved he may be by the "uncovenanted mercies" of God. To these, of course, communion with christians of another name, was uncongenial. But another class, who still were strenuous for Episcopal organization, as being of divine

appointment and matter of obligation upon all men, did yet argue that other churches, holding the pure doctrine of the gospel and practising its precepts, are *true* churches, though unsound in matters of government; and were willing to give full credence to their acceptance with God, from the fact, that God in his providence had most abundantly conferred on such, in common with themselves, the graces of the Spirit. To persons of this way of thinking, it was in no wise inconsistent with a proper preference of their own sect, to unite with the pious of every class, in acts of christian intercourse and of common christian effort.

Douglas himself appears to have occupied a still broader ground, which he held in common with a few influential clergymen of his own church. Episcopal ordination was desired by him upon two grounds; one of *conscience*, the other of *inclination*. For first, he was clear as to the promise of usefulness, and felt that God assigned him a share in that ministry, because in that He had opened before him the choicest hopes of doing good. This too, was the church to which his early and unchecked prepossessions naturally led. In its rites he had been nurtured, and its baptism he had received. Here dwelt his friends and kindred; and he could not choose but say, "peace be within thee." To its constitution also, and its modes of worship, his judgment set its seal. Its petitions and thanksgivings, which grow deeper in devotion by oft repeating; its impressive litany; its solemn anthems, which elevate the soul to heaven; all its decent and orderly modes of humble approach to the King of Kings, gave impulse, in his bosom, to a chord that sent forth tones in unison.

With respect to any peculiar divine efficacy in Episcopal ordinances, or special sanction of Episcopal succession, or obligation upon men to range under the banner of that one church,—he did not hold to their reality. His mind took hold of the present age, and not of the ages past. He loved his mother church for her matron graces and care of his childhood, much more than her primogeniture or lineal descent. Need his brethren apprehend from this, that he loved with cold affection?

The Episcopal church is one of the few that have in themselves the elements of permanent existence; and such in the main, as it is at present, there seems no valid reason to deny it may continue to be to the end of time. What the subject of this narrative was in holiness, we may judge hereafter, when we come to see his lovely piety as developed in his ministerial labors and sufferings, and all the heart's most inward feelings brought to light; but we feel, from the history of his sentiments thus far, that it describes a minister of that stamp of Episcopacy which will flourish in the millennial period.

Among the various christian denominations, sectarian principles prevail, similar to those which have been pointed out as common in the Episcopal church. In that church they fix themselves upon forms of worship and ecclesiastical government; but in some others, upon unessential sentiments or points of doctrine. The mental principle is alike in all; and the result is, much real, and still more apparent difference among churches. Unbelievers mark the discordance of opinion and of feeling, and derive an argument exactly the reverse of that saying of the ancient pagans, "See how these christians love one another."

Now, while this contention and jealousy among evangelical christians prevail, it is all the while true that the contending parties are actually the same thing in doctrine and practice, notwithstanding what is thought by others and themselves of their great diversities in both. The world, when it argues a discordance among evangelical sects, about the real truths of religion, is altogether weak in its conclusions, and wrong in its premises. The writer's course of life has of necessity made him an associate of every sect of evangelical christians. For months he has sat under Episcopal ordinances, then again he has wandered where the Methodist preacher alone teaches the lonely neighborhood the word of God; he has listened to Baptists, to Lutherans, to Presbyterians; and observation constrains him to say, that all these do preach the same system of truth and duty. Prayers and sermons take a stamp as the preacher is a man more or less in earnest,—of large or narrow comprehension; and in different classes, peculiar modes of thinking show themselves. In worship some approve what others deem irreverent; yet throughout the sects known commonly as evangelical, to all essential ends of the gospel, in the humble shed and lofty temple, the *same great truths* are set forth, though not certainly on the same philosophical principles; and one with no more reason can infer from their different hues, that Methodist and Congregational christianity are not the same, than he could conclude that the light from planets is not the same, because one is silvery, and another rosy.

It is true, among the more zealous sectarians of every title, one occasionally meets with manifestations that look like great diversity. If, for example, a warm Methodist in a course of teaching, should meet a Presbyterian thought; or a warm Calvinist come down into Arminian enclosures, or either strike on some distinctive point to which great adherence must be exhibited—then, awhile, the sound of stormy zeal takes all the listening audience; and not till the earthquake and the fire are over, is the waiting soul arrested by the gospel's still small voice.

Most men do not know how speedily intercourse and friendly acquaintance, would break up all the importance usually attached to

party names. It is to be lamented that they do not. A congregationalist of New-England—one that has grown to manhood with no partiality for denominations diverse from his own, would soon feel disposed to put himself and them on a common footing. He would see, to take an illustration from our literary institutions, in a Methodist, Baptist, or Episcopal college, a common benefit to christians ; and would rejoice in their prosperity and enlargement.

Such, preeminently, were the feelings of him whose life and spirit are the subject of these pages. To him the summit of all desire was reached, when souls were gathered in to Christ ; whether by the ministration of his own chosen ordinances, or in some foreign land, under the shade of a banana, by the voice of the itinerant missionary. His own modes of worship might be very dear ; but in that mind there was no feeling tinged with tenderness which did not flow out in love to any, however named, and and wherever met, who were to be companions in eternity.

The mind of Mr. Douglas was exceedingly fearless in the search for truth ; and only the more so from feeling a solemn accountability for his opinions. He was fond of thinking, as well as acting, without regard to name or party,—as ready, in the views of doctrine which his judgment approved, to side with an Arminian, as a Calvinist. He was therefore able to decide with candor between opposing writers, and had the disposition to obtain from such as on the whole, differed from his views, all the light and truth he could ; a disposition which is more commonly commended than indulged, and which there would be less need to notice if it were more prevalent. As a second consequence, his modes of reasoning sometimes gave alarm to those who were accustomed to walk in more beaten tracks. By this must be explained the fact that, in the course of theological inquiry and debate at Andover, having penned a doctrinal essay on an important subject, he was refused the opportunity of reading it in the presence of the class, in the customary course of dissertations ; and that afterwards at the institution in New-York, to which this memoir shortly will conduct him, now and then a sentiment of his was looked upon as tinctured with heresy. In short, he was a reasoner of that class of which the age, as one may hope with reason, is to be prolific, who do not hesitate to discard old and venerable maxims, if they seem to stand in opposition to the bible and correct philosophy.

The year spent at Andover, was ever a source of grateful recollection to Mr. Douglas, for the benefit it yielded, both in theology and a knowledge of the bible. But in September, having completed one year's course, he removed his membership, as at first designed, to the Episcopal seminary at New-York. Here, it is evident, his christian character gained great tenderness and enlarge-

ment. He was in the bosom of his own church and people. The ministry to which he looked was near, at hand. He held familiar intercourse with devoted christians of his own sect, and met frequently a pious circle of Dr. Milner's congregation, with great satisfaction and profit to his soul. The tender relations of life—in part the most tender of which the mind is capable—began more nearly than ever to gather around him; and so entire a habit had he of consecrating all to God, that social enjoyments and a warm regard for his dearest friends, added to and formed a component part of the current of religious life. Among the records of the incidents and feelings of this period, there is one passage which details some portion of an evening's conversation with the Rev. Mr. N——, by whose ministry his thoughts were first awakened to a religious life; and were it not for the allusions it contains to private history, we should insert it, as exhibiting the deep and permanent interest which he felt, in one who was made under God the instrument of his conversion. A few quotations from the Journal are here inserted.

March 5, 1825.—It does seem that, for two years, I have been in a state of cold speculation and stupidity; enjoying scarcely any communion with my God, communing little with my own heart, careless about the salvation of others, and almost forgetting how many, even around me, are perishing in sin.

But this term, I hope, God has mercifully arrested me and led me to think on my ways.

My Sunday school has contributed to enlist my feelings. Writing two dissertations on "Foreign Missions," has led me to trace the history of those holy labors, to learn more about the wants of our world, and see more fully, in the experience of missionaries, what it is to come out and be separate, and do *all* to the glory of God; to take up the cross and follow Jesus.

I felt deeply, at Dr. Romeyn's funeral, the address of Dr. Mc Auley—"so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom." It was, to ministers, peculiarly emphatic. I hope too that the sickness of Dr. Milnor has been a blessing to me, among many: I feel thankful too at having become acquainted with some of his most pious people, as well as being led to their Sunday evening prayer meeting. I thought myself fast losing a fondness for society; but I find myself, while sick of fashionable, sinful triflers, enjoying more than ever, the society of Jesus' devoted disciples.

B—— is to be ordained next Wednesday at New-Haven. I do long to be at work in the wide field, having a people looking up to me as their dear pastor—only may I have a sufficiency from God.

Sunday evening.—Went to the lecture-room where there was a prayer meeting, to return thanks for the restoration of our dear pastor. The room was full. Mr. S—— and T—— spoke most affectionately. I could not but think of the saying of Catharine Brown, "Oh! what a day it will be when all christians meet in Heaven." Only when called upon to lead in prayer, my heart seemed full of spiritual pride; but in that future meeting there will be no sin to embitter the holy joy, no heart not in full tune for unending, uninterrupted praise.

March 8.—Yesterday morning I read in Gardiner's Life, until the exercises at St. John's. The service I enjoyed, and felt very tender under P——'s sermon on repentance; but that of another on falling from grace, chilled me to the heart. Instead of depending for a continued supply of grace on my own faithfulness, I wished to trust only to that *sovereign mercy* which will lead back the wandering sheep, sooner or later; and I felt, that if I had "believed in Jesus," I might also, with St. Paul, be persuaded that "he is able to keep that which I have commit-

ted to him, against that day." After dinner I engaged a room for next term, talked upon several religious topics, and spent half an hour with Dr. M——; who lent me bishop Ravenscroft's sermon against bible societies. The whole principle of it is papacy; and the whole circumstances of its delivery highly improper; I am heartily sorry, for the honor of our church, and for religion, that a bishop should have done thus.

June 29.—Yesterday afternoon I spent an hour with ——: We dwelt on the death of Mr. D——n; then she told of the death of Miss B——, some years ago, and read Miss Huntley's notice of it, and of others, in the annual address to her scholars. Our hearts were full,—we contrasted the feeling and the characters with all that is fashionable in this city;—the grave-yard at New-Haven, seemed a hallowed spot, where we should love to repose until the resurrection morn. There was a sweet solemnity and tenderness which I could wish always to possess.—This morning I have been meditating upon death and heaven.

Jan. 15.—To-day I have been in an uncommonly hallowed frame. Visited two Sunday schools,—one of them large and interesting, of the Methodist connection, which I addressed a few minutes. The superintendent said, that some elder scholars were quite serious. My mind still tender as it was yesterday, feels more and more all earthly good unsatisfying. I wonder God should ever stop my wandering heart, and soften it, to feel his presence and prize his love.

While applying his efforts to the acquisition of that knowledge which was necessary to a clergyman, Mr. Douglas was anxious to improve every opportunity of conveying spiritual benefit to his fellow men. Not only in the seminary, among his fellow students, was he active in promoting social prayer and spiritual views and feelings, but out of it he exerted what influence he could to promote a similar object. Many a social circle for prayer was enlivened by his presence. The Sunday school felt his pious influence as a teacher of the young. To a colored congregation, in the city, he was accustomed to read such devotional extracts and to impart such instruction, as might lead them to the Savior of sinners. Once in each week, upon a stated evening, he visited the garrison at Bedlow's island, in company with a fellow student, to proclaim there the glad news of salvation. There was, it may be truly said, no act of his life which was not designed to have a reference to the ministry, and to the world to come.

Though years had now matured the mind and person of Mr. Douglas, he was still, in appearance, extremely youthful, a characteristic which he retained to the end of life. His heart retained likewise, its youthful qualities, its ardor, its sensibility, and its tenderness, except when disease preyed alike upon the system and the mind. But over all this native tenderness, the propensity of Mr. Douglas to ponder the events and incidents of each passing hour, threw such an aspect of composure, as made the depth of his feelings pass commonly without notice. The upper stream of life flowed on in such a current of considerate action, as gave on its tranquil surface, but little indication to the careless eye, of the gushing springs below. He was thus able, in times of deep emotion, to rise above the influence of the strongest feelings; and to act under

the control of those safe and prudent principles which are commonly ascribed to calmer modes of being.

He was habitually thoughtful, even about common actions; and cautious in important steps, reasoning long and aiming at full knowledge, before deciding as to what was duty, what was wisdom. Some indeed deemed him cautious to excess, consuming time in self-debate and forecast of results, when action should already have begun. Yet *consequences*, except in things of mere expediency, had but little weight in his ultimate decision; and that decision when once formed, lost no force from the difficulties which it had to encounter. Obstacles, in fact, were usually foreseen when they existed; for habit made it natural, as well as circumstances necessary, to forecast his plans, even in their minute relations. These he understood so fully from studying all their possible bearings, that he was rarely taken by surprise, what way so ever events turned. Meeting repulse and aspersion with grief rather than resentment, bearing meekness on the front of cautious independence, he might be said, in some degree, to join a dovelike harmlessness to a wisdom like the serpent's.

He was able, by a species of apt and light winged observation, to collect inferences from an almost infinite variety of acts in men, which to most persons would have no significance. Character, in its nicer shades especially, was to him a kind of natural and spontaneous study—resulting in a peculiarly deep insight into the human heart, both in others and himself. Being much secluded in the world from the common topics of desire and passion, he loved it mostly as a world of immortal beings, and for the hope of doing good to fellow-sinners: choosing in other respects, to live with slight relations either to its cares or pleasures; centering attachment on the circle which had watched his childhood; the loved companions that his heart had won, and the works of God, which showing forth his power and glory, even now give to earth some dim reflections of the heavenly world. How easily did his affections kindle, on meeting varieties of character, and intellect which offered hope for this world or the other. The mild combinations of sweet virtue and judicious or brilliant thought which are exhibited in the female mind, seem ever to have been held by him in pre-eminent regard; and many a fine intellect, joined often to a pure and holy life, are depicted in his Journal with a care which shows that such characters were treasured up in his mind for pleasant and warm recollections.

One may imagine how this capacity of deep interest in the qualities and states of other minds, enhanced the charm of his intimate friendships. Burdened as the heart is with irrepressible anxieties, one best knows the countless value of a friend, when a sympa-

thy that meets our trouble and *understands* it, flows from his breast spontaneously. Common minds, too, are capable of discerning when kindness, even in a stranger, chimes with their affections and wants; and, to one whose office it was soon to be, to minister consolation and persuade souls to flee from the wrath to come, no intimacy of acquaintance could be needless, with the springs of human feeling—the affections, sympathies, longings, relentings, which, fallen as man is, are the cords that bind him to eternal happiness.

Every thing as a friend, that man can be, Sutherland Douglas was, in unity of feeling, and tenderness and permanence of affection,—and all that *he* was, is treasured in sacred and salutary recollection, by more than one surviving heart. The sweetly sober spirit of his actions, is natural to the thoughts of such as were wont to meet him in the social hours of life—as natural as the smile upon his countenance, when children, won by accents of kindness, ran to offer their infant lips to his kiss. But, on the other hand, what he was in times and circumstances in which the more robust qualities are called out, his own words thus express. “The truth is, when engaged in study or business, I am all in all devoted to the matter in hand, and do not allow myself to be interrupted or defeated. Towards those whom I do not love *very much*, (and those I do are few,) I rarely exhibit any tenderness of disposition, for I cannot pretend feeling. Therefore most persons view me in the exercise of other qualities; and they who know me mostly as a student, or a man of business, would be surprised, could they see the workings of my heart in the time of freedom from care; and especially its working towards some whom it holds so dear.”

But if the exercise of warm affections was thus congenial to his heart, and the circle of chosen companions and relatives one of the choicest treasures of this life—a circle which mingled with his hopes whenever he thought of heaven, or dreamt of years of usefulness below—there was a second element of happiness in the love of knowledge. The foundations of that love were doubtless laid in a perception of its absolute necessity, to one who undertook to do his utmost in the service of his Lord; but, as knowledge is in the highest degree consonant to the mind, and conjoined with love and peace of conscience, is an element of happiness to every being that is happy, he loved it too, because it is a part of wisdom. As events carried him on from stage to stage in his earthly career, and past one subject and another of lofty and fascinating study, he looked out like a traveler, with longing, upon many an extended view, from which the onward course of life was soon to hurry him away. But such acquisitions as the duties of life and limited faculties of man admit, he made. The fine writers in a few ancient and modern tongues, he was able to relish in the original; and was so

far read as a scholar, that when at last he came to set foot on the other continent, he was able to receive a vivid delight from the historical and classical associations connected with one spot and another, in the countries which he traversed.

From these traits of heart and intellect, an idea sufficiently distinct for a clear insight into the extracts that are to follow may be formed of the character of Mr. Douglas; and thus much it seemed best to introduce, at the period to which this memoir has now descended, when his life was lingering between the last days of the student and first of the pastor.

The following true and useful view of church government merits attention. Its author seems to adjudge to Episcopacy the claim of "primitive and apostolic;" but not to find, except as matter of preference, that religious moment in the question, which is assumed as well by those who *deny*, as those who maintain them. Certainly it is a question which, however engaging as a point of knowledge or inward partiality, has no connection with vital piety.

"As to the ministerial commission, sacraments, etc. I believe Bishop H. and others sincere; and I see that, from the starting point of one principle, there proceed two opposite systems: one making an external commission regularly transmitted from Christ essential: the other putting the authority of a minister on the same ground with that of a ruler. The circumstances of society show that some men ought to be chosen and set apart, for these concerns; the mode and form to be determined by circumstances; and the bible to show how far they discharge the duties of the office—a man's own conscience, as in other things to guide him the choice of what is best—and yet a Presbyterian, Baptist, and Episcopal minister may, alike, possess authority sufficient. This latter theory I prefer, though I have never seen or heard it stated. It is no more liable to abuse than the other. The Episcopal form I prefer, on the ground of adaptation to the character of society, not chiefly because "primitive and apostolic."

Again, at a much later period:

"Read Hooker's eight books of Ecclesiastical Polity. Was astonished to find his first, and much of the others, viz. the fundamental principles of church government, consisting of the same opinions I had come to a year ago, without having met with or heard of them. He puts civil and ecclesiastical government on the same ground, as to divine authority; that system of each, which is *best in given circumstances*, is desired by God, and ought to be adopted by men; but neither, to be authoritative, requires a regular succession of rulers, at first externally appointed by God himself.

Jan. 11th, 1826—All day Monday felt much elevated above the world, and uncommonly kind hearted towards every body. Though our recitation was on disputable points, I had no inclination to dispute, and avoided it. Yesterday heard E. G——'s sermon on St. Paul's authority from heaven,—well written. Bishop Hobart's criticisms were excellent. He seems to be a spiritual man, as well as one of talents; though some of his favorite sentiments I think decidedly erroneous; i. e. about extemporaneous prayer, co-operation with differing sects in benevolent operations, the doctrines of grace, exclusive Episcopacy.

Coming home at noon, had little wish to live, if my place might be supplied. Indeed, when I saw S. pursuing the same course I intended to pursue, felt that, if he could do as much as both of us together, I should be ready to die, or to sit a silent and unnoticed spectator of the progress of the cause of Christ."

The independence of Mr. Douglas not being physical, but finding its origin and support in purely moral qualities, was no proof against the blows to which its intrepidity exposed him. No man received a wound more easily, and none bled more profusely. It has been stated on a previous page, that sentiments of a cast like those upon church government just quoted, had proved a ground, already, of distrust towards the one who entertained them, among those who are called—alas! these party names—“High Church Episcopalians.” In present circumstances, this occasion of his disquiet was far from having lost any thing of its harassing influence. He had, in fact, settled down in the expectation that this would be to him, through all his ministry, a source of suffering and embarrassment,—perhaps of limited usefulness,—as in fact, it proved. Much of this might have been avoided by a course of action merely negative; but such were not Mr. Douglas’ views of duty. His heart, it may be said, was cradled in the New Testament—its very dye was evangelical; and if he judged prevailing notions to be barren in their consequences, and thought that love to men and vital piety could never spring forth unshackled under their reign—it was right, in declaring his emancipation to sacrifice both influence and repose, and the good will of many brethren.

One occurrence, at this time, made a deep impresson on his feelings. A letter of friendly communion from the Princeton “Society of Inquiry” had been received by a similar society in the institution at New-York, to which the latter, by vote, declined to reply. In such measures the heart of Mr. Douglas would not permit him to unite. “Stating mildly, but explicitly, that I would not be identified with a society of such principles, I took a dismissal, to the surprise of all. There was a deep pause,—my heart was full—and my eyes allowed it to overflow.” It was, therefore, a relief from immediate inquietude, and the apprehension of serious impediments to come, when, in answer to a letter written to the Bishop of Rhode-Island, he received a welcome to his suggested plan of passing two months there, under the bishop’s tutelage, and receiving ordination at his hands. After several weeks, having first received a dismissal from the Seminary, he was on the way to Bristol.

May 2d.—Left New-York—felt much relieved. There was a thick fog; and twice, we just avoided running on the rocks; however, we were preserved. I never felt before so much of that “peace which passeth understanding,”—felt ready to die or to live, and labor in the ministry—to commit all things to God.

May 18th.—On Wednesday last I was ordained. The bishop’s remarks at table, and all day, were very appropriate—full of wisdom and piety; he seemed, more than ever, like a father to me. My feelings were very tender and my heart full. May I never forget or be unfaithful to that day. I feel now as if consecrated to the salvation of souls in the ministry of Christ.

May 22d.—Yesterday I had not only to preach but to read the service—and

performed it three times; although several begged me not to do so, it being my first effort. While the audience were very attentive, some from curiosity, some from affectionate interest, the remark of Martyn several times came home to my heart,—“Oh! did they but know that my root is rottenness.”

June 4th.—This morning was communion,—my heart very cold and wandering, full of pride—desire to preach well to-night, as I am to preach on 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16. There is a pride of faithfulness, solemnity, orthodoxy, as odious as the desire of simply pleasing, whether by matter or by manner. The former pride much troubles me.

July 8th.—My feelings have been tried to day. Before a family circle, — read me some lines which seemed to me, perhaps mistakenly, intended for severe ridicule upon some points of taste in Miss — and myself, as unfolded of late, and particularly, in our Wednesday's sail. I may have deserved it. I know my feelings are peculiar; and that, when I meet with character of a certain cast, I show my preference too plainly, and indulge in admiration, with such persons, of our favorite beauties of scenery and character: I have too much pride of refinement and the like. But those lines came like a blight upon my heart. They made me mourn—not chiefly for myself—but for the condition of men. There was no emotion of personal resentment; but the sense of a wound to my most deep and delicate feelings. At our evening meeting read Rev. 22, and spoke a half hour on the 16th and 17th verses—felt solemn and tender, and raised above this world. Being the last I shall attend here, it was to me, peculiarly interesting. Amid all my pains and pleasures, more and more I long to flee away and be at rest: could I only see all I love, seeking, with me, a city to come.

July 9th.—This morning my feelings are so tender I could hardly, at the breakfast table, keep from shedding tears. Could I have deserved that reproof?—the very thought is worse than the reproof itself. I trust it has done me some good: it has given that tenderness and humbleness of spirit which I love,—and, especially, on the sabbath. I feel as if I could preach to-day with some affection, by reason of these circumstances, and it being my last in Bristol. (Noon.) Through all the morning exercises felt very tender and humble. One lesson was, it happened, Acts 20, Paul's farewell to the Ephesians. Oh! that all were applicable to myself. Of one thing I am certain; that, here, “I have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God.” I feel indifferent to-day, to the praises of men, and to most circumstances of place,—if I may only be a meek, affectionate, faithful minister of the gospel.

Having fulfilled the charge committed to him in the bishop's absence, of ministering to his congregation, the young laborer was now to leave the place made precious as the field in which his hand had first been privileged to scatter the good seed; where he had had ministered both publicly and in private, at the Lord's house and at the grave, in the sick chamber, and on those occasions which our present state of being numbers among its most joyful and sanctioned festivities. Leaving behind him scenes and persons, that he could not fail to love, he went out into the field—the world, and “Providence the guide.”

Leaving the future for a while unsettled, he traveled much during the four following months; preaching both at Troy, and at many near and distant villages and towns. Upon a tour made in this period to Quebec, by Niagara, and the rapids of the St. Lawrence, and his returning tour down Lake Champlain, the following remark occurs; “this very tour has made me more ashamed of my species—more dissatisfied with the world: but in the charge of my

Redeemer, "go ye into all the world," &c. I find that which throws over this state of probation a new beauty and greatness, and points *every* human being, (not ministers alone,) not only to his duty but also to his happiness and highest attainment."

Returning to Troy, where a general interest in religion was at the time prevalent, he was greatly encouraged by the influence of divine truth upon his near relations; and by the interest with which a boy eight years old, who had been awakened to a pious life by his former preaching at that place, came to make inquiries respecting the paths of wisdom and way of eternal life. It was here too that the plan was formed, which he afterwards carried into execution, of spending the approaching winter at the south, in the labors of a voluntary mission.

In November he was present in Philadelphia, at the Episcopal convention; where his heart rejoiced over the progress of true religion and correct sentiment in his church. Returning to New-York, he awaited the companions of his southern voyage; and sought in the meantime, an interview with the bishop of that diocese, who had once taken steps respecting an alledged breach of discipline on his part, but who at a later period gave him the most gratifying proofs of personal kindness. In this city he was subject to sorrow, chiefly from the "coldness and distrust" of many, towards whose well-being his heart went out in warm desires. Yet it softened instead of irritating his feelings—weaned him from the world—made him cling to the children of God, and seek in God himself his portion. That an unchanging comforter was ever nigh, let such scenes bear record as the following.

Nov. 20.—Read service in the morning yesterday, for Dr. M——; and in the afternoon preached myself. It was the anniversary of the Sandwich mission from New-Haven, and a pleasing coincidence that, just four years after, Mr. Charles Stewart, the missionary, should be hearing me; and that (at the same hour of day at which I saw him depart with no prospect of returning) my sermon heard by him should, at its close, be as expressive of our feelings on that occasion, as any thing I could have written purposely. It was my sermon on "Love to the Brethren." After church we went to Mrs. S——'s, with whom and Miss K——, at the departure of the missionaries, I waited on the wharf to catch the last glimpses. On three anniversaries, of the four, I have happened in their company; but could not have thought it possible that Mr. S—— himself, on either, should be with us. I read my sermon to the ladies, as suited to the feelings of us all; and we spent the whole evening in prayer and conversation and singing—closing with "Wake, Isles of the South," and "Blest be the tie that binds."

It was not like earth;—my heart was so full that I could talk but little. Oh! there is that in christian fellowship, even on earth, which the world know not; what then will be the fellowship of all the holy in heaven forever and forever! Oh, the purchase of a Savior's blood—the ties of souls alike redeemed, and tending from earth to heaven.

On December 10th, his vessel, the *Statira*, sailed southward.

Our limits forbid us to dwell on the occurrences of this tour, or of the two succeeding years ; at the expiration of which we find Mr. Douglas settled as pastor of a young and promising church at Rochester, N. Y. The events which transpired during the interval, had materially changed the course of his life, or left a deep impress on his mind. He had traveled through the southern states, and had returned enriched with spiritual wisdom and extended observation. He had found a temporary resting place and field of labor, in the charge of St. John's church at Georgetown, D. C. ; whence he had passed to the rising and important station from which his influence was beginning now to be diffused.

The same interval had been witness to his marriage, the crowning act of an early attachment. As in him all acts were made the handmaid of religion, and his enjoyments and sufferings were equally the instruments of eradicating sin and promoting his growth in spiritual wisdom, so did this deep current of affection which wore its channel through so much of his life, minister to the graces of his christian character. In addition to these changes in his outward circumstances, a deep change, in the interval, had passed upon the man himself. A malady of the digestive organs had commenced its ravages both on his mind and body, producing torpor, restlessness, undue excitability, and heart sinking,—a disease which often preys upon the man, while it denies him the common lenitive of human sympathy—tasking him to move about with the semblance of activity in the duties of his station, while the very springs of life are failing.

On the character of Mr. Douglas, these painful visitations had a refining influence, as he was able clearly to discern. He now reaped the benefit of his early and untiring observation of the mind's various modes and habits ; for he was thus enabled to discover in this life, the design of many a dark dispensation, to unravel which he must otherwise have waited for the disclosures of a future state. Temporal enjoyments were now cut off, or turned into sources of pain ; and his soul was thus called up to God for happiness. His disappointments and sufferings gave the reins to this, and power to that undiscovered propensity ; laying bare the more *hidden* estrangements of the heart, and thus finishing the work, and unasked, bringing out the results of protracted self-examination.

It is probable from a remarkable passage which we find in the *Journal of Mr. Douglas*, during the interval in question, that this disease had commenced its ravages long before he was aware of its existence. He there describes a temporary wane of social feeling, and decay of sensibility, which was singular in a mind of so much tenderness. This decay he ascribed to causes purely mental ; but as they seem hardly adequate to the effects assigned, it may fairly

he conjectured that disease, even then, was lurking in his system. The effect, when limited to himself, was burdensome enough to one whose pleasures lay so much in the warm affections—but became enhanced almost to desolation, when he saw it reaching some, whose happiness had become entwined with his. After relating that in the summer of 1826, attachments had less power than usual on his mind, and religious feelings, at the same time, more, the passage thus continues.

The journey to Quebec, and my intercourse with the family of Gov. S— proved an exciting cause to my mind, as had my intercourse with — of — during the summer. My visit in Georgia, the winter of 1826—27, had a like, but a still more powerful, effect in keeping alive and enriching my social feelings; especially my intimacy with Mrs. W—, Mr. B—'s family of Mount Zion, Mr. T. C— and son's families of Augusta, and those three interesting widows, Mrs. S—, J— and W—. It was a winter in every respect full of instruction in the character and condition of men, and in the Providence and grace of God: To this hour the memory of it always comes over me like a breath of life; and those names are likely to be immortal in their power over my mind. But the final departure from all these friends—the lonely journey on horseback, through Tennessee and Virginia, had a paralyzing influence. When I was again in New-York and New-Haven, and Vermont, and Troy, I proved that feeling had almost died within me. There was a calm content, an indisposition to intellectual activity or *business* of any kind; but no social tenderness nor power to interest or to be interested with even those who are nearest and dearest. It was a crisis in my history. The effect upon —, discovered in a visit at M— and Lake George, and its effect too upon —, made known about the time, determined me to struggle for a new existence. Oh! what would I not have given then for the heart I had in former days! I was as a withered tree, mocking those that had hung upon its branches, and cherished its life. And a cloud brooded over it, from which one stroke of lightning, it seemed, would scathe it forever. But the cloud burst forth in drops that went to its heart's core. The sun shone upon it still—it leaned awhile upon those that had clung to it, and for them and for Zion's sake, it renewed its youth. Trusting that it is "planted in the house of the Lord," it seeks "to flourish in the courts of our God" forever, thus "to show that the Lord is gracious, and that there is no unrighteousness in him."

It was after this record, that Mr. Douglas, declining several invitations, accepted the one to which we have before alluded, at Georgetown; and having in December 1827, been united in marriage, at New-York, to Miss Harriet L. Staples, daughter of Seth P. Staples, Esq. formerly of New-Haven, had entered on that field of labor. It was a delightful spot to them; the society was polished, and the more spiritual portion were "very—very interesting and valuable." Thus happily situated, the call to Rochester found them, and circumstances made it a call of plain duty. But, simultaneously with this removal, we may trace the first severe stroke of that disease which ultimately brought him to the grave. Still, after long abstinence and travel, his health seemed sufficiently revived to justify a public entrance upon the ministerial charge at Rochester. In the middle of September he took up his residence there—in three weeks was settled in the parsonage; and on Nov. 23d, received priest's orders from Bishop Hobart, in St. John's church at New-

York. The following extracts record some incidents and feelings of his new situation.

Dec. 24.—In intercourse with society, and even religious dealings with christians, I have continually to feel that there is much more of talking about religion than acting for it; more care for congregational or individual interests than for the salvation of souls and glory of God; more pride of acting than humble gratitude for the privilege. In short, in reference to religion, few bring to her service the spirit of Christ or of Paul; or the habits, even, of *men of business*. We ought to "work with our might while the day lasts," and much more for our God than for ourselves. And this implies a consciousness that the day of life cannot be long; and that, for any work, the *best time* is the *first possible*. If in matters of the world we think thus, why not in those of heaven?

Just seven years ago, to-morrow, christmas day, I first went forward to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, at New-Haven, in Mr. Croswell's church. Not one hour of the intervening period has been what it ought, or what it professed to be. When I think of the way in which God has led me, I am lost in wonder. Conviction of sin is sweet when it exalts the cross of Jesus, and places us at his feet. How interesting to me the coincidences of to-morrow! Our taking possession of the basement; our first communion as a people; the anniversary of the birth of our Redeemer, and also of my first partaking of his body and blood with the professors of his name.

Dec. 29.—Yesterday was like spring. Our basement was well attended, morning and afternoon. I preached on being ashamed of Christ, with all my energies, and an unusual sense of the authority and sacredness of the truth; but not with so much child-like feeling as I sometimes can possess. My mind had been discomposed and grieved by a request from some, that I would give two of my best sermons to "strike those who would come out of curiosity." These appearances of policy and courting, so unlike the simplicity and faithfulness of the gospel of Christ, and of Paul, dishearten me more than any form of temptation without. Nothing so warms and encourages and draws out my energies, as an evident seeking after and valuing of the truth and cross of Christ.

July 29.—Oh! the character of God, how rich,—so holy, so just, so wise, so good! Without it to rest upon, how unmeaning, how trying this life; what would become of the human mind!

FAITH in this character, how it overcomes the world! What else can do it! I never saw such proof of this as in Mrs. —: Her husband, after taking tea on Saturday as usual, was found dead in his garden, by a rupture of the heart. Such agony as hers I never witnessed, such heart-rending appeals; yet even then she had a clear conviction that God was reigning in the event, and reigning wisely and kindly. He seems to have been training her to meet it and to triumph in it.

To-day my spirits have been sunk; and more than once, of late, I have felt my heart almost broken. I have seemed so worthless, so sinful, such a trial to others in this life—yet so unfit for another! At any moment, to-day, I could have wept; and more than once my eyes did overrun with tears, as I thought of my faults, my duties and my sufferings. But to-night I feel as if I had been enabled to do good, and get more, in conversation with Mrs. — about God. As I prayed with her, I could feel that we were little children, and he our Father.

She even now, has been cast down with doubts; but, after some poor suggestions of mine, a new meaning of the late event, and her whole history, opened upon her. She seemed to see a token in her present child-like confidence in God that she might call him *her* Father,—and she said it was all she wanted.

She knew before, that God was a rock—but not that she herself stood upon it. Her spirit, of late all agitated, had before been calm under the presence of God; but now, it was brightening under his felt reflexion. And Oh! to see it—to be at all instrumental towards it—it was enough for my heart. I felt happy to live.

I have very severe trials as a pastor, but God will determine the result.

The preaching of Mr. Douglas derived its substance from the warm and practical truths of religion. It was full of earnestness and persuasion. Common persons felt its force, though it was

often *contemplative* in its character, and better suited to an audience of highly cultivated intellect, than to plain and unreflecting minds. It was, doubtless, requisite as to the mass of hearers, that they should be molded to it, ere the full results could be realized, which might be looked for from the ministrations of one possessing such piety and talents. The necessary time, however, was never granted; the longest single term of service being at Rochester, and that scarcely a twelve-month.

That period of life, however, was chequered in its limited circuit, with much variety of desert and of green. One standing topic of thanksgiving was the accession to the family circle of a little son, now four months old, promising and lovely as the parents' hearts could wish, who had been given to God from birth, and was early baptized by the father and called by his name. The chief occasion of inquietude, (made more heavy by constant bodily derangement and debility,) resulted from his unmixed desire, which others did not entertain in the same undivided measure, of building up a congregation which should be purely spiritual. In fact, the hopes of doing good at Rochester, and all the treasures of spiritual expectation and desire which a young minister had laid up with tears, and prayer, and longing, were soon to pass away. It was a populous and growing village of high importance, and all the arrangements of the congregation had been made on a scale too large, though only meant to meet the local circumstances and the enterprising spirit of the place. The discovery of some uncongenial elements in the congregation tending to divert their co-operation with him in spiritual things, joined to broken health, had a strong effect to repress their clergyman's pastoral abilities, and to prevent them from appearing in their true character. It is probable the people were not aware of the spiritual treasure which they possessed; so that, on the occurrence of a change of times, their own pecuniary embarrassments were left to press so heavily on him, that neither the man, having dear dependents, nor the holy office, exempt as it should be from worldly cares, could sustain the pressure. Under these painful circumstances, without one indication of wounded pride, he resigned his pastoral office at Rochester, in August 1829.

"All things work together for good to those that love God." The faithful in a day of trouble, sometimes enjoy such inspirations of holy affection, as to bedim, and to themselves, obliterate all past experience. Thus what God denies to the present hope, he makes up in the spiritual well-being; sorrows, as well as smiles, bring the young character to perfection. So the immature fruit, long nurtured by both sun and rains, suddenly swells and blushes, mellow and rich for the garden of God. Having left Rochester, Mr. Douglas was called to Quincy, Mass. to fill the place made vacant by the

ill health of the Rev. Mr. Cutler, and here we find this man of God pouring forth his soul in strains like these.

Mrs. R— rode with me to the church-yard ; and I had a dear talk with her as a child of God, trusting in him under the loss of her little one, and looking up to me as her Pastor. To-night I preached on "Whom in heaven but thee," Psalms 73 ; my soul really absorbed in it, and above the world. Oh ! it is a precious state of mind. I have deeply and dearly loved the ministry to-day ; and yet I never before so felt my nothingness in it. It is a clear, cold, windy night, —the moon almost full in the heavens : and the feeling has been in my mind that ere long—perhaps very soon—I may be sleeping in my grave, (the world none the loser.) The thought is serious and tender ; but it is very, very sweet to my soul.

Dec. 25th.—I know not when I have had such a sense of the elevation, and love, and condescension of Jesus, his power now exercised, and his coming glory, as I had in my study this afternoon. Yet my heart was cold, compared with the subject and longed to comprehend and be filled, and burn over it, like the angels and the saints in light. At the same time my own history came before me. Nine years ago to-day, I first went forward to the "Lord's supper." And oh ! what a period. My choice of a profession, my attachment to Harriet, my course in the seminaries, my ordination, my marriage, my several residences, my housekeeping, my intercourse with friends as a professor of religion, my whole official and private course—it seems to me that scarcely one movement has arisen or proceeded upon real love of souls, or sense of the worth of Jesus and fellowship with God. Not one but that I felt had been corrupted, and prayed him to blot out from his remembrance ; to create me now anew ; to cleanse the very thoughts of my heart and fill me with his spirit, that I may perfectly love him, and worthily magnify his holy name. Yet, thanks to his grace, I did feel that I loved the ministry, and counted the office indeed, a rich grace—richer than any to angels given.

I did seem to consecrate my all to him in this service. He is precious to me as he is to those who believe. For my parents, and brothers, and sisters, and all I love, I asked no other portion than the joys and triumphs over sin, and death, and the world, of this faith in his name. I saw the advance of his latter glory. I prayed for my fellow ministers in his cause. I felt that he would dispose of us where and as he thought best ; and that he will build up and extend his Zion, and make her the joy of the whole earth : And I asked not to know or to choose where I should be laboring in the vineyard—so I might do all in my power for his glory and the salvation of the world, and on resting from my work on earth, be with him—a pure spirit in heaven.

"I love thy kingdom, Lord,
The house of thine abode ;
The church our blest Redeemer saved
By his own precious blood.
Sure as his truth shall last,
To Zion shall be given
The brightest glories earth can yield,
And brighter bliss of heaven."

While life was passing in these holy joys and sorrows, disease made no pause in its ravages. A few ill-digested morsels of food had power, in spite of the most rigid abstinence, to become the constant source of extreme mental and bodily irritation. Now and then a breeze of health would come over him, reviving the mind and bringing back the freshness of youth ; inspiring such expectations of permanent relief, that it was finally determined to accept an invitation at Fredericktown, in Maryland ; if upon trial,

his system should be found capable of sustaining the charge. With a view to this trial, Mr. Douglas preached at Quincy a farewell sermon, the last he ever wrote in America. The subject was well suited to one who was so soon to bid farewell to earth—"life the infancy of being." Then with his family, taking leave of his dear, temporary charge at Quincy, they reached New-York at a time ever after memorable in their history of private sorrows; for there a sudden stroke of death cut down their infant in the early flower.

It will be interesting to learn how such a father sustained this new and unlooked for affliction. It may be gathered from the review which he afterwards took of the event, while yet recent, at Fredericktown; to which place he had gone, leaving at New-York the partner of this and every sorrow,—now made more dear by this last privation. Having mentioned events as they occurred after leaving Quincy, he goes on to relate in order, his own absence during the child's short illness; his return—and it was dead. The child's departure had been peaceful, his mother sitting by him, and "his corpse most beautiful." At New-Haven, in the family lot of "that sweet burial ground" a grave was prepared; and there, himself, and two relatives, and a brother clergyman the only witnesses, all that was left of that young hope was buried. In concluding his narrative of these tender events and incidents, the father adds:

But how shall I describe the feelings arising out of this series of events, now stated.*** My dear wife has been wonderfully sustained. It was a trial to leave her by herself—to withdraw the arm of her husband and the touch of his throbbing heart, when the "pet lamb of her bosom," expected to supply his place, had just been snatched away. But I trust that he who is better than father or husband is with her still; and that he will restore her health and deepen the foundations of her happiness.

All the circumstances of little Sutherland's departure were ordered in kindness. He was a most promising child, in mind and heart. *No one* knew how dear he was to me. I was afraid to indulge my tenderness towards him, I felt such a responsibility about his character. My associations with him will always be full of deep meaning and tears. I am too fond of children to have had one so promising, all my own, to become what I should have endeavored and prayed; and then with my health restored to enjoy his growth and fellowship: And I feel happy that a Father in heaven took—to form him for eternity amid the spirits that are perfect, and in the immediate presence of himself. I do believe the dispensation full of wisdom and mercy towards us his parents.

With this must terminate the ministerial career in America of our departed friend. The issue of the temporary experiment then making at Fredericktown, to determine whether strength and spirits adequate to the demands of a pastoral life remained, settled the fact decidedly that they did not. Entire suspension from all mental labor and anxiety could alone offer a hope of radical amendment. A voyage to Europe, and a sojourn of several months upon the continent, were at length decided on; and on the 10th of June 1830, the last sail faded that bore him from New-York—to be seen no more. But oh! what waves of mingled hope and misgiving rolled

over his breast, while the shores were yet in view ; what passionate expressions of attachment escaped his pen ; what bitter and causeless self-reproaches. Sensitive by nature and habit, but depressed or unnaturally excitable from disease, he had all along been in some respects, a trial, from very sorrow, to those whom he most wished to bless ; and now, all loved and confided in as he was, he thought a world of desire would be filled, if he could assure others of a love equal in return.

On July 4th he writes from Havre, where he had just arrived. After a few weeks stay in Paris, it was his design to pass into the Netherlands and Holland, to remain awhile in Switzerland, and go thence to Italy. We have no room to narrate more than detached incidents of this extended tour, in the circuit of which many principal cities were included, together with scenes of the highest historical interest and works of taste, as well as wonders of created magnificence and beauty. He ascended some of the most interesting mountains of Switzerland ; and in one instance, being enveloped in snow, he barely escaped with his life, by returning, while some fellow-travelers who ventured forward, were lost. Here we are taken by surprise—it was so unlike him to return. Reposing awhile at Geneva, he met with a kind reception from the clergymen and people of the persecuted church there ; in whose society and intercourse he was favored with a new and striking sense of the privilege and blessedness of holy living. Passing thence into Italy as far as Rome, he was conversant awhile both with the soft scenery of the region, and its accumulated monuments of art and aged superstition. After a lapse of some months, he returned to Paris through Genoa and Toulon.

The wide regions which were the witness of his wanderings, have often been traversed by the traveler and the scholar ; and nothing can be here added to the knowledge which they have brought back of nature, and art, and customs of society. But few more spiritual travelers have moved among their scenes, and none, perhaps, have more fully recorded their impressions ! It is an interesting record, indited by the hand that now writes no more, embodying the reflections of a child of God on the wave, in the city, along the rocky ledge ; every where gathering more enlarged capacities to understand and to do his Father's will, and deeper sorrow for the estrangement of our race from God and happiness. "All that I have experienced," he writes from Rome, "whether pleasant or painful ; all that has drawn my attention in nature, or art, or human society, has tended towards one and the same impression,—a more realizing sense of the fallen estate of our world, and the spiritual wants of its inhabitants ; my own sinfulness, and the vanity of worldly pursuits ; the grace of God in Christ Jesus, and the responsibility

and preciousness of the ministry of his cross. If there be one awakened energy, any concentrated longing in my mind, it is to be an instrument of my Redeemer in that ministry; to spend my days in the simplicity of a heavenly mind, doing all that Providence shall allow in blessing the sphere of its probation. I have been here in the solitudes of nature's majesty; in the city crowd; amid the best reliques of genius—the most interesting monuments of ages past, and the revolutions of the present; and what do they tell me? That the mountains shall pass away as a scroll; that man is a vapor, and at his best estate vanity; that our race have sought out many inventions, and are in the shadow of death. I have marked the pursuits which distinguish them in every clime. They are every where the same; 'the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life.' The body is all in all, the soul sinks, sins and dies."

The foregoing paragraphs present the reader with an outline of the course pursued by Mr. Douglas in his travels, and the general impression which a ten months' observation of our race upon the other continent, left upon his mind. But in the manuscript which forms the record of this period, there occur passages that rise in interest above the ordinary current of narration; and such of these as there is yet space to embody in this memoir, it is meet that our pen should record, while it may yet linger among these last memorials of an early friend, full soon, alas! summoned to the tomb.

Of the extracts which follow, the first is taken from a letter to his wife; and bears date at Geneva, after a part of the circuit of Switzerland had been made.

Sept. 10th, 1830.—Traveling, you know, is always unfavorable. The irregular hours—necessity of making arrangements at every turn for the one to follow; the continual succession of new objects: and an American in Europe, of course encounters all these in the extreme. But besides them all, he finds the sabbath comparatively little regarded; and as to those who do love God, (few at most in any country,) he cannot understand their language. For these reasons, along with the groundwork too fully prepared in my own heart, I have not had so much truly religious enjoyment as I had at Quincy. The voyage was in this respect, the best period of my absence. Still there have been times when I have felt peculiarly the presence, or if not the presence with me, the excellence of God. Scarcely a day passes without my owning the need of a Savior, and the preciousness of christian fellowship. And I think that, aside from every corporeal, sentimental, intellectual advantage of this tour, I may carry home to some field of pastoral influence, results of my own observation and matters of religious experience, of much value. Such things give a reality, an authority, an entire worth to the bible. It is good for practical application, to find the book we have read in childhood, by some secluded spot, so verified in maturer years and over all the world. It is good even to miss elsewhere, what we have learnt at home to expect every where, and to identify with the very name of religion, and even of cultivation and existence itself. Still, wherever I may be, and whatever I may have experienced, I feel that *sin* will abound in me to the end of life. I will say also, though from a cold, deranged, all-polluting heart, that every thing in Europe conspires to make me feel that there is a God, though so unsought by most; and that life is valueless without Him, whether for prince or peasant; and to rejoice

that, in early life, I was called to receive him as my God—as my guide even unto death. Pray that I may be led home to declare him with all my soul, and to show myself the more alive to save souls from death, and the more constrained by the love of Christ. Let us—my more than wife, my sister-spirit for eternity—let us leave the things which are behind and press forward to those which are before.

The next extract exhibits the emotions which were excited by a sudden view of Mount Blanc, though not the first. Having entered Switzerland from the Low Countries by a course along the Rhine, he had already been upon "the Rigi," at that time a region of sleet and storm,—had ascended the pass of "the great St. Bernard," and crossing from Martigny to the vale of Chamouni, had first caught the overpowering majesty of Mount Blanc from the summit of the "Col de Balme." Journeying on to Geneva, whence the preceding passage was written, he was now making an excursion up the valley of the Arve to the "Baths of St. Gervais," where the scene is laid of the following narration.

This morning I was in doubt whether to remain or not; but concluded that I should like the Circle well for the sabbath, and that I would come to the church of "Notre Dame de la Neige" in time for the service; and in the meanwhile enjoy my solitude among the mountains. It is the last chapel on the way across the mountains; a walk of three hours from Geneva, and one hour beyond any village, as it were on the border-line between the inhabited world and the solitudes of nature,—only two or three houses about it; the interior full of Romish inscriptions and gaudy ornaments, pointing more to the virgin Mary than to our Father in Heaven. Yet there was one motto, over one window, which struck me as very appropriate—"His foundation is on the mountains." At one pass on the way, I could not but stop to look at the scenery behind me.—To pass over smiling fields, and a foaming stream hurrying through their midst, there was what in most countries would be a mountain of the deepest and richest green; behind it several summits—and one most graceful slope, of the whitest snow, and above, the sky in its best combination of blue and white. Supposing it the Col du Bon Homme, I said to myself—certainly I have found a rival to Mount Blanc; but I learnt that it was that queen herself of European mountains. I never had such impressions of the beautiful, the elevated, the pure; and the one thought was, if such can be made out of matter, (a thing we tread upon,) what may not be made of the eternal spirit; what may we not try to imagine, or own beyond our imaginings, as to the Infinite One, the Creator of all.

The night was passed at an obscure spot called "Nant Bourant," not many miles from St. Gervais, and in the midst of the "circuit of Mount Blanc." It was the following day that brought with it the peril already mentioned, which he was near encountering, and which overtook the companions of his way. The whole passage forcibly exhibits the hazard and extreme labor at which travelers sometimes purchase their most valued indulgences.

Monday when I awoke it was snowing fast—not a distant object to be seen. I made up my mind to return that day to the valley; but while I was dressing, seventeen pedestrians arrived, members of some university, on a vacation range. They invited me to join them, and my desire to reach the "Aller Blanche" induced me to do it. Leaving my knapsack, I took only a cloak and my long mountain pole; without the latter I could not have succeeded at all in gaining some ascents. We started forth single file—the guide in front, ourselves unable

to see any distance because of the storm. It had covered the ground already to the depth of a foot; and we were obliged to take turns as to marching in front, to make the path. No one but a guide accustomed to traverse it could have told where it ought to be; and when found it is, even in good weather, so steep and rough that Mr. Henry Dwight pronounced his journey over it the most fatiguing day's work of his life. You may well believe that even his limbs would have quailed that morning, if after ascending continually three hours, he found himself as I was, up to my thighs in snow. Sometimes we fell our whole length, and I rejoiced I had been disappointed at Nant Bourant, as to obtaining a mule; for nothing would have tempted me to rest on any other feet than my own in those passes. I had soon after starting, become convinced that there was little chance of a clear view and fine weather at Aller Blanche. So I declared my intention to return; but the guide would not let me—saying I would certainly lose my way; and I doubt not he was right. However when we had just reached the summit of the Col du Bon Homme (not half the way to Cormayeur however,) we met three men conducting some cows and sheep. So taking them as companions and guides, I returned forthwith to Nant Bourant; stopped only for my sack, and held on my way to the baths of St. Gervais, twelve miles farther. That valley, so smiling the day before, was then all clouds and rain—and my natural reflection was, how sudden and entire the changes of life.

I neglected to say that while I was breakfasting at Nant Bourant, four Englishmen arrived with a guide; and I doubted whether to join them or the party of seventeen. We left the former to dry themselves and take breakfast. When re- turning I met them an hour from Nant Bourant. An hour after I passed them they lost their way, near the spot where I turned back,—the storm thickened; one of them and the guide had to carry another of the four two hours, in snow up to the breast—then leave him to die: he was an Episcopal clergyman from Brighton, England. Shortly after another failed and was left to die: while the two with the guide were only able, as night closed on them, to reach a chalet off the way, the only one within some distance.

The seventeen, whom I had left, and the guide, soon lost their way—could see nothing, and wandered for hours in the deep snow before they reached the chalet. Oh, may I, thus watched over—I, redeemed with blood—I, who at every turn in life have been a creature of grace; may I have returned to give glory to God!

We insert, next and last, the concluding paragraph of Mr. Douglas' private journal, dated Florence, Oct. 31st, 1830.

The mere consciousness of returning life, of elasticity and sensibility, in contrast to deadness and inertia, is enough for me; but it is not yet so entire and constant with me, but that when it comes for a day or an hour, it fills me with tears of tenderness, and sends my heart out of myself towards my friends and my God.

It was in such a state that I enjoyed our service—and especially the administration of the Lord's supper, this morning. It is the first time of my having an opportunity to receive the latter since my departure from America,—I mean in our own church. And the service never seemed to me so dear, so expressive, so like the soul communing on earth with its God and Savior.

The 146th Psalm, a part of the Psalter, I found in my bible marked "Sept. 4th, 1825." But what a different being I was then! how much more suited and needing and able to enter into it now! especially the 3d, 4th, 5th, 9th, 10th verses. Oh! it is precious.

"THY GOD, OH ZION! SHALL REIGN FOREVER;" and we who believe in Jesus are born and brought to "*praise Him while we have any being.*"

Oh! my Father in heaven—hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done here as it is in heaven. Give me my daily bread (with thee to provide we cannot want) forgive my sins, and amid all the temptations of the world, deliver me from its evil, and from the worse evils of my own nature. And then I will learn and hope to praise thee as the Infinite God, forever and ever.

The symptoms of retiring disease had long been so uniform, that Mr. Douglas felt his hopes of firm health progressively brightening;

and when again at Paris, in April 1831, he felt almost adequate to reassert his wonted vigor. He was not so well, however, for a few days previous to the 22d, which was the day of his arrival in London. It had been his wish, after a short residence in that metropolis, and before embarking for America, to spend the interval in a brief tour through some parts of Scotland, and to arrive in New-York about the end of August. But now a fever and debility came over him; thought by some to have been a new and distinct disorder,—by others, only the terminating crisis of the old one. In either case, it fastened on a system shattered and incapable of vigorous resistance. Its violence was aggravated by excessive exercise, taken under a mistaken impression that the disorder was nothing more than a return of common and old symptoms. Happily there was present with him a friend of his early years, Mrs. Willard of Troy, through whose counsel and watchful care, aided by other friends, he wanted nothing when laid low with sickness. The disease proved to be a stupifying fever, which threw over its subject a general insensibility, permitting only at times a clear perception of things around him. In a lucid interval he was told the apprehensions of his attendants. He received the communication calmly, and desired that the physician should be made acquainted with his character, and told that it would not startle him to know the worst. Being asked to mention a clergyman in whose spiritual offices he would most confide, he named the Rev. Daniel Wilson of Islington, with whose writings he was acquainted.

Mr. Wilson was spending the evening with some friends, when the note was delivered to him stating the situation of Mr. Douglas, and his confidence in Mr. Wilson's spiritual character; and requesting him to call immediately on the sufferer, that prayer might be made at his extremest need, for one who could no longer pray for himself. This note Mr. Wilson read immediately after family prayers, and the little band again prayed—not for themselves, but for the stranger in distress. Mr. Wilson then hastened to the chamber of his sick brother, and joined in prayer and conversation, which seemed to be received by him with satisfaction, though sometimes with imperfect consciousness; and which are remembered with gratitude and gladness by all who loved the dead.

When Mr. Douglas was asked if he had any messages to leave for friends in case of his death, or any directions about worldly concerns, he replied that he had none. "In that case," said he, "it is impossible for a man to utter what is in the depths of his heart; but for months I have been writing to them, and been particular to write *all*." As to worldly affairs his expression was, "you will find every thing in a state of singular completeness." And so indeed it was. Every article was properly disposed, every paper

labeled, every direction written,—the work of life was fully done, its troubles ended, all its sufferings over. As a laborer, when his task is finished, goes weary and worn out to repose—as the stars in a misty night sink to their rest to rise again in the glories of the east, so did he rest from his labors and sink into the grave. His remains lie buried in the vicinity of London.

Some months after, the Rev. Mr. Nettleton, to whom he owed his first religious impressions, being in company with a number of clergymen of the English Church, was called upon to describe those revivals of religion by which God is doing so much for the church in America. He told them that he was taken unawares, that it would require many interviews like that to do justice to the subject; but that he would relate some incidents of a revival in which he was interested ten years before, at New-Haven, in which Yale College was situated. “One of its first subjects was a young man of promising talents, of an amiable disposition, of interesting manners, who afterwards entered the ministry of your own church. I watched his progress with much interest, for I considered him as one of my spiritual children. He was settled first at Georgetown, then at Rochester, where he lost his health, and was obliged to visit Europe for its restoration. I learned that he was improving not only in health, but in christian character, and was anticipating his return to his own country with increased desires and ability of being useful, when he came to London—and died here. I have been from one end of this great city to the other—I have inquired of many if they had ever met him, but the name of SUTHERLAND DOUGLAS was unknown to them all—can you tell me any thing respecting him?”

Mr. Wilson came forward, his eyes full of tears—“My dear sir, I can tell you all about him: I attended on his dying hours, and he now lies buried in my family-vault.” There was not a dry eye in the room; and this circumstance was soon known and related in almost every religious circle in London.

And it may be added, that when this was told at home, there was one whose heart more than all others united, had missed his presence in the places which shall now know him no more; who had wondered that at least his remains might not have been laid by the side of his little babe,—but when she learned that he now lies a monument of the grace of God in revivals, to be read in other lands, to the glory of those spiritual wonders of which he was a fruit at home, she felt that even the spot of his grave was not unmarked by providence, and that not a hair of his head had fallen to the ground without his Father.

ART. V.—THE RECTORY OF VALEHEAD.

The Rectory of Valehead. By the REV. ROBERT WILSON EVANS, M. A. Sixth Edition. London, 1832.

WE took up this book with a kind of foretaste of the pleasure we were to derive from perusing it, when we learned that it treated of a *christian home*. What idea is more delightful to those who have enjoyed the reality, or in itself is more beautiful and touching, than that of so hallowed a place. In respect to ourselves, our minds kindle in contemplating it as the best representative of heaven upon earth—as the seat and source of pure thoughts, heavenly charities, gentle cares, lively joys, or softened regrets. In its happiest condition we cannot but view it as the birth-place of whatever is fair and great—as an epitome as well as nursery of the church of God.

Home, however humble its character, or uninteresting its external circumstances, is proverbially delightful every where and among all men. It is the one blessed spot where the fancy loves to linger, and to which men look back in after life with the deepest interest. The picture of Goldsmith need not be applied to the dweller on the Alps alone,

“Dear is that shed to which his soul conforms,
And dear the hills that lift him to the storms.”

How often has the smile of the cosmopolite been provoked at hearing the praises of some rude and lonely home, on the part of one who thought there was nothing better in the whole world! We have known persons, almost all whose claim to respect, rested on their attachment to the house of their fathers. Even in families where the curse of ebriety, or some other curse, has been experienced, and where the joys of home have been mingled with great evils, the strongest domestic love has been felt, and the mind at a subsequent period has reverted rather to the brightness than the gloom with which its early dawn had been associated. Home being thus generally an object of pleasing recollection, even under unfavorable circumstances, what must not a christian home be to those who have known its blessedness! It is so superior to the ordinary domestic condition, in all the attributes of good, that it may almost be said with the author of the volume under review, *the christian alone possesses a home*; and this remark would seem to be confirmed by the fact, that the least religious people in Europe, are also the least domestic. Christianity, which has found here its fittest field of influence, has indeed given it a worth, a sacredness, a purity, which never attached to it under any oth-

er religion. If it has not made it altogether a new thing, it has remodeled its form and imparted to it a loveliness worthy of its original design.

There is a natural curiosity in men to become acquainted with the domestic life of others. The passion is universally felt in regard to our neighbors, since few things please us more than the family legends and anecdotes of the circles around us. In the history of man in every situation, it constitutes a powerful charm. It is the first thing that attracts our attention in the accounts of foreign countries. How eagerly, also, do we seize every intimation which comes down to us concerning the domestic life of the ancients ! It is delightful, when the opportunity is presented, to catch the old Greek or Roman at his fireside with his family around him, that we may learn their habits, appearance and employments, even the utensils which they used and the furniture of their dwellings. Considering this feature of the human heart, the conception was a happy one of describing a christian home, not so much in its outward circumstances, as in its internal arrangement, its intellectual and spiritual training, its solid pursuits, solemn relations, and diversified trials. Among the many new contrivances of the times, this fancy-piece is by no means the least deserving of notice. It promises not a little aid to the cause of household religion, the prosperity of which is its express object.

The author of the *Rectory of Valehead*, if we may judge from the number of editions through which his book has passed in England, has been fortunate enough to secure the patronage of the reading public—a circumstance, of course, gratifying to the feelings of a writer, if not always an indication of the superior merit of his performance. The work, however, is in itself quite a happy attempt, well timed, and suited to the wants of the church. He had observed, as he says in his preface, “amid the crowd of books which are daily issuing forth directed to individual conduct, how few there are which notice the peculiarity of the christian home, essential element though it be of the great body of Christ, and cradle of the christian’s social graces.” He, therefore, took occasion to treat the subject, not in the way of a regular dissertation, which he conceived ill-suited to its nature, but by giving a miscellaneous detail of circumstances ; “since the best part of the history of home is made up of a multitude of minute and irregular incidents.” On this ground also, he has ventured on the intermixture of prose and verse, as either form of composition seemed best adapted to the different scenes he wished to portray. But though the author has thrown his thoughts into so peculiar a form, and given the volume a very miscellaneous appearance, it is destitute neither of connection nor unity of design,

and aims at that "one great end without which no deed is good, no thought is worthy, no affection is pure." As a specimen of the topics he has selected, we may mention the following, viz. the constitution of a christian family, the family liturgy, the external communion of the family, the first member sent out into the world, the annual meeting of the family, the first death, etc. These are alternately interspersed with hymns and other pieces of poetry, suitable to the sentiment which had been previously set forth, and designed to extend it and point out its application. The forms and the spirit of the English established worship are maintained, but on its purest model, nor should any one of any denomination, object to a piety so serious and practical, in whatever department of the church it may be inculcated. A slight texture of narrative appears in the work, yet it is not in the ordinary run of a novel. The excitement is produced, not by the story, but by the thought. The incidents are designed merely to introduce the sentiments, or to convey the instruction which the writer wished to enforce.

In regard to the family which Mr. Evans describes, represented to be that of a former rector of his parish, every thing is pure, and true, and venerable, as his purpose was rather to portray excellence, than to disclose the obliquities of the heart—to represent families as they should be, than as they are in reality. It is true that he has painted beyond life—he has conceived, perhaps, a perfect idea of a christian household, and his readers occasionally experience the dissatisfaction of finding too little resemblance between the most exemplary families they have known, and that which the author holds up to the imagination. But then, such is the tendency of the representation, they are made to feel dissatisfied also that families are no more christian, that christian households generally are so distant from the mark at which they ought to aim, and the desire is excited to see something in this department of society more nearly approaching the standard of the gospel. The discrepancy between his picture and the reality, is that which exists between a pure ethical theology, and the ordinary practice of pious people. It is on this ground that he justifies himself in the course he has taken. "The picture," he says, "presented of a christian home, in the following pages, may be thought scarcely capable of realization, in ordinary practice, at least when the present state of society is considered. But on the other hand, it must be borne in mind, that as our whole conduct in life should be a continued pressing on to reach a point of excellence, which, the farther we proceed, proceeds also in advance farther into the regions of purity; therefore the person who undertakes to instruct, must prepare a model, which, while approachable by

various tempers in various degrees, shall be unattainable by any on the whole, otherwise it would fail to supply the necessity of the case, and cease, after a certain point, both to stimulate and instruct." But though in all the particulars in which the author portrays a religious family, no household could have sat for its likeness, yet we seem after all to see much that is near to his fine conception, in pious families of the better sort; and we can pass without any strong revulsion of feelings, from this delineation to some living scenes. The plan of the author in respect to the purity of the characters he chose to describe, is a pleasing exemplification of the sentiment of Dr. Johnson, who maintained that in fictions, morally good characters, and of course morally good actions, should be selected. That distinguished ethical writer saw not, why readers may not as well dip at once into the living vicious world, as to meet with all characters promiscuously portrayed in writing.

The sentiment inspired by our author's representations, is entirely opposite to the notion, that children may be brought up with too much strictness of religious discipline, and that as a consequence, they will be more vicious, or at least more disposed to disregard religion, than if they had been less restrained. Now to this we say, that all the charm and power of religion consist in its full and accurate developement. If strictness of religious discipline, in domestic society, be adopted with a view to reach an exact scriptural standard, then there cannot be too much of it. It cannot be too strict. But probably by the notion in question, is often meant some unwarrantable excess in particular things, some undue severity of manner, some inconsistency of requirement, supposed to exist at times, in those who would educate their families religiously. In this view, it is not strict religious discipline which is to be condemned, but contrariety to it, a violation of the rule of the divine word, in the instances specified. In respect to a perfect plan of domestic temper and conduct, if such a one can be presented, it is obvious that no harm can accrue in contemplating it, though it should be unlike any thing seen among men. It might even induce people to attempt an approach towards it, and the nearer the approximation, of course the better. It is clear, that only as children are trained according to a strict and consistent scheme in religion, are they likely to realize its full advantages, or to become truly pious. The family religion of the rector of Valehead, is designed to be consistent and complete in all its parts, and so far is he from admitting the idea that religion and religious usages can be enforced too strenuously or too frequently, that it is made the leading object at which he aims, to enforce them to their greatest possible ex-

tent, in the best possible manner. It is evident that Mr. Evans has looked into this subject with no careless eye, and that his rector correctly understood the relations which a christian home bears alike to its individual inmates, to society, and to the church of God. His manner of deriving some spiritual thought, or religious instruction, from the numerous physical circumstances that affect a family, is extremely happy, as also his adaptation of scriptural language to those circumstances. This is a prominent feature of his book throughout, and constitutes one of its principal attractions.

But it may be proper to notice some of the contents of the volume a little more in detail. The following passage is an instance of that simplicity of style and liveliness of illustration which are so common in this work.

Such was the account given by my friend of his father's opinions; and ever since arriving at this view of a christian family, I have regarded with indescribable interest the meeting of my congregation on the Lord's day. I see family after family trooping in, each in itself a little church, perfect in its organization, standing in peculiar relation to God, and now merging, by the unity of one altar, one faith, into a nobler and larger division of Christ's body. It presents to me a lively image of that universal body in which all churches, past, present, and to come, are comprehended; and of the several portions which compose it. Here, I have thought, as a family knot advanced in shewy pomp, followed by liveried lackeys, here is a church insolent with prosperity, and, like that of Alexandria, inviting by its overweening pride, the chastising rod of its Master. Methinks I can almost hear the awful words pronouncing, "Repent, or I will come unto thee quickly." Another group, evidently in good circumstances, but clad in mourning, recalls to my mind the flourishing church of Carthage weeping over her Cyprian. Another arrives, modest in behaviour, plain yet neat in dress, walking arranged in order before their parents; and I think of the golden days of the church of Ephesus, when the rod of persecution was still impending to chastise any trespass beyond the bounds of sober simplicity and meekness, and she had not yet learned the insolence of prosperity. A fourth arrives, and by its tattered habits, and squalid countenances, in which ignorance and stupidity are strongly pictured, presents to my imagination the present church of Constantinople, bowed to the dust, no less by its own superstition, than by the sword of the infidel. Thus I cast a rapid glance through the christian church, and conclude by arriving at the consummation of all things, at that great day, when there shall meet in congregation before the throne of our Lord, churches, and nations, and families of different ages, different tongues, different quarters of the earth, and all be gathered into one great family; and father, king, and bishop shall all merge into one title, and be ascribed with all honor and glory to the universal head, Jesus Christ our Redeemer.—pp. 21, 22.

The practice described below in the good rector's family, together with the representation of its effects, is worthy of the consideration of every christian family. It will be admitted by all who feel aright, to be a question of the deepest concern, how we shall order our families so as to answer the great end of their institution—the temporal and eternal welfare of all their inmates.

This family, like its model the church, had its peculiar days of commemoration for blessings or chastisements. Among these, I found the marriage-day of

the parents, the birth-day of each child, anniversaries of recovery from dangerous sickness, and also of the final release of some member from this world of trouble. Thus the whole earthly history of the family was run through in the course of the year, the memory of God's dealings with them constantly kept alive, and a grateful sense of past mercies was continually preparing them for the reception of new.

From this cradle, said my friend, (a son of the rector who was describing the family,) we came forth into the world, strong in principle, inured to reliance upon God, and with no slight acquaintance with the human heart, which we had derived from our habitual unreservedness, and were thus spared the disgust and corruption by which such experience is so dearly bought in the mart of the world. Life is a recurrence of similar occasions, varied somewhat in aspect; and all occasions at home having been met with the proper feeling and principle, and well noted and discerned by our system there, left us, on their repetition on a larger scale in the world, but little perplexity. Even when absent, we enjoyed to a considerable degree the comfort and protection of home. Is it nothing to be assured that we are the objects of continual prayer? Is it nothing to know that at a certain hour we are joining our prayers with others, and are united at the foot of the throne of God? Besides, we often enjoyed its holy influence in a manner quite incidental and indirect. Well do I remember how, when once upon the point of yielding to a very strong temptation, a clock struck the very hour of our evening prayer. In an instant, our family group appeared before my eye; I heard my name put up in humble and earnest entreaty to the Almighty Protector, expressions of our domestic liturgy flashed upon my mind with a vivid light, and I repelled the assailant with a lively indignation, and felt as if I crushed it with the might of a giant.

I have since seen much of mankind, have been the guest of many families, and what I have observed in them has convinced me of the wisdom of the economy with which my father ruled his own. I have seen very many amiably united in the bonds of affection, but very few, alas! in those of religion. In almost all, the serious thoughts connected with another life, seemed studiously kept down in the bottom of the bosom, not as treasure of which the owner was jealous, but as an occupant of which he was ashamed; they seemed to be withheld as endangering the unity of home, not as confirming it, and that suppression of opinion on worldly matters, would be considered disingenuous, was on this point industriously encouraged. Perhaps a sudden blow of misfortune came upon them, and they turned to God, but it was in stupor and amazement; family prayer was established, but like the book of the law found by Josiah, it was heard, after a long neglect, by untutored ears; and, unfortunately, there was always some one member of the family not in unison with the rest, one of whose inward satire all stood in awe, to whom the others were individually conscious of some folly or other, and fearful of his secret ridicule, and imputation of hypocrisy, were altogether deterred, or spent the time of prayer in thinking of him, and not of God; in fearing him, and not the Lord. Taken up with so faint a spirit, it could not last long; the presence of guests was enough to shame them out of it, and after several interruptions, which became stronger and stronger, and several revivals, which became weaker and weaker, it was finally dropped by a consent, which, however tacit, was apparently much more hearty than that by which it had been originally established. Few seem to be aware of the difficulty of setting on firm footing effectual family prayer, of the time which must elapse before each bosom can break through the prison of its reserve, and stand revealed to its neighbor, before it can reach that state of purity and confidence which fears no rebuke, experiences no aversion to confess, disguises not its wishes, and before the brother and the sister, the delicacy of the one and the manliness of the other, find at last that common language which God had given, but the world had destroyed—before the same thing can appear in the same light to different minds, and what was formerly an object of levity and banter, can become to both parties a source of seriousness and of anxious canvass. O, my friend, be assured upon my experience, that where religion is not predominant, there is no stable home, the joys of that house are but sources of future sorrows, its affections mere ropes of sand. pp. 35—39.

The Annual Meeting of the rector's family, is represented as an occasion not merely pleasant, but profitable in the best sense. The spiritual improvement of common incidents is praise-worthy, but the description is in part an instance of that exaggeration to which allusion has been made.

The day was well known to the neighborhood, and a crowd of congratulators was collected around the door, the poor were regaled, the steeple rang a merry peal, and on the Sunday our procession to church passed through a long lane of parishioners, who made a point of coming from the remotest paths, despite of all obstacles on this day, to testify their esteem for their pastor, by every token of reverence and love. The day of arrival was one indeed of breathless hurry and agitation. The interval necessary to welcoming the arrival of one dear object, and indulging the first burst of affection, was yet unfinished, when another was announced, and the last straggler was seldom gathered in till the moment before the clock, whose simple well-known knell then went to the very heart, summoned us to evening prayer; and oh! what prayer was that. Our hearts were full, even to bursting, with the sensible proof of God's mercies, past and continued; and the expressions of our simple liturgy, interwoven with every thing most dear and sacred, the spiritual milk of our childhood, coming now to our experience with a deeper meaning, and put up still in that voice to which from our cradle we had listened with dutiful and affectionate reverence, searched every secret of the bosom, and poured out in a full tide of adoration at the throne of mercy. The day passed in the mutual communication of our several states and prospects, from which we often digressed to the younger members of the family, still unfledged, who were now before our eyes, growing up in that discipline, to which we felt ourselves so much indebted.

Our family rose early, for indulgence in sleep was always reprobated among us as an injury done to nature, both in body and mind: but my father was ever earliest. Whoever first entered the room, always found him engaged over Scripture, or some volume of divinity, which he then laid aside; at this time he was more than usually cheerful. As each entered the room, he regarded them with a fixed and penetrating look, from which a benevolent smile round his lips took off all that could make it in the least disagreeable. I have heard him explain it: he would say, I know of no feeling so exquisite, though it has every day been repeated for so many years, (praised be God!) as that of the sight of my family in the morning. Having myself risen quite a renovated being, no particle remaining of that weary, and perhaps painful load, with which I yesterday night pressed my bed, and seeing them whom I then parted from, returning to me with smiling and healthy countenances, I experience a renewal, as it were, of my existence, and, fresh myself, seem to receive my children afresh from the hand of God. I look and scrutinize their features, that I may discern in them traces of that blessed communion, from which they are just returned to earth and given to me again, and when I press their hands, I feel a union with them which is quite unutterable. And do you think, that upon such an occasion I do not look forward to that last morning of universal rising, when the good, having cast off the bandages of pain and care, with which they lay down to rest, shall rise in heavenly vigor for everlasting day, and I too (I humbly hope) shall receive my family at the hands of my Savior, not one member wanting, never to part again. Oh! the thought is my continual stay and comfort. pp. 84—87.

The author's remarks respecting the effect of natural scenery are so just and beautiful, that a passage deserves a place here.

This view always excited in me an undefinable melancholy, which I believe to be the universal effect of beautiful scenery upon minds capable of enjoying it. That melancholy, however, was so far from unpleasing, that I sought the indulgence of it. There was in it a sanctity of feeling, an outpouring of the heart before God, a deep sense of my fleeting estate here, and an earnest yearn-

ing after things still better and more beautiful than what I beheld so glowing around me. Every sensible bosom must experience somewhat of this, but I place its peculiar character among the many happy results of the society and unremitting sympathy of a religious home, which is of such efficacy as to continue its impulse upon our solitary moments. Living under the same moral clime and mental sky, we never feel distinctly apart from each other, and assured of our spiritual union, can afford to indulge in reflections upon our earthly separation. Of this separation we are warned by the face of nature, the instant that we quit the door. Her steadfast and unchangeable forms, her mountains, her rivers, and her valleys, come into immediate contact, and contrast with the changes of which we are conscious in ourselves, and sensible in others. The fading foliage of the wood, the transitory gleam of sunshine, awake, indeed, the same feeling; but there we seem at least upon a par, and regard the lesson which they read us as the admonition of an equal, born to die like ourselves. But in the lesson which is read to us by the changeless and unorganized forms of nature, there is all the decision and sternness of a superior. We feel ourselves looked down upon, fleeting beings of an hour, by these gigantic witnesses of our creation. Hence a feeling of humiliation and melancholy which I have often thought it required all the consolations of christianity to combat: combined, however, with these, I found it pleasing, so that I could regard all with a cheerful smile, take their rude and menacing hints with all good will, and the more dear to me the objects of home, the more could I afford to indulge in it. Through a perishable world, I looked to an imperishable; I felt safe and fixed in my spiritual station, and, like the spectator described by the poet, felt peculiar and heightened enjoyment in the view of its contrast, with the violent and unceasing changes around me.

When the mind has once come to this understanding with nature, and arrived at what lies beyond her brute and outward shapes, it acquires a wonderful power of analogy, and rapidly passes, by means of visible objects, as by symbols, to what is invisible. A prospect spread before it, like this, seems (but I cannot adequately express myself) to be an enormous vest thrown over the spiritual world, to prevent our giddiness, by hiding from the eye its tremendous profundity, and we delight to speculate upon what portions of that world may lie beneath this or that fold of the garment, and give it its peculiar shape. A moral starts up to the mind in every object, every thing around pours forth a spiritual lesson, and the eye with more powerful magic than that enjoyed by the hand of Midas, turns every thing to gold; peculiar thoughts, and peculiar combinations of thought, present themselves in a scene, however familiar to the eye: the least difference, as a gleam of light, strikes a different key-note in the mind, leads a different arrangement of thought, presides over a different melody. Thus the mind runs through its whole compass, becomes acquainted with all its resources, feels conscious of its capability of enjoyment, and derives that enjoyment from objects and changes of objects, which to the vulgar, if observed at all, appear minute and uninteresting. pp. 97—100.

The chapter on the Mother, cannot be read by persons possessed of correct feelings, without a lively sense of our obligations to the gospel, which, according to the fine representations of our author, has conferred immortal honor on the sex. The thoughts are not altogether original, yet they can scarcely be brought too often into view, to enhance the claims of christianity on our cordial esteem. It is a matter of delightful reflection that woman, and woman in the ordinary ranks of society, was allowed the privilege, as she felt the duty, of doing so much in aid of this religion in its early origin. She indeed was to realize from it in all coming time, the most signal benefit. Not merely were fishermen and tent-makers its advocates, but the Maries, the Joannas

and the Susannas of Galilee, and not queens, as there will be hereafter, were its nursing mothers. In the gracious covenant which christianity reveals to us, or rather in which it consists, "the mother has been restored to all her legitimate sovereignty, and great and incalculable is her influence. Like some fine concentrated perfume, it penetrates with potent but irresistible agency, every nook of home, pervading where the coarser authority of the father could never reach; it begins with the first breath we draw, with the first light we see." From this chapter we might present some fine passages more at length, but are deterred by the difficulty of selection.

The First Marriage in the family is a beautiful little piece, rich in scriptural allusions and serious views, particularly that portion of it which consists of the rector's farewell address to his daughter. The application of the thoughts and language of the bible to the event described, is indeed the most remarkable quality of the piece.

The Library of the old gentleman furnishes the reader with several sensible and interesting remarks, on a topic naturally suggested by that indispensable part of a clergyman's household establishment. We select a single passage.

Unsuitable to our years as such books may at first sight appear, my father never took them out of our hands, nor remanded them to the shelf; he understood human nature better. He well knew that the peculiar and original bent of the child (if he have any character impressed at all) is often leading him to books from which the herd of grown-up people turn aside as uninteresting, or as being at all events, out of the ordinary track of amusement; and to the mind of a reflecting parent, what can be more interesting than to watch such a choice? what, indeed, more gratifying? since it stamps to him the child's mind with a character at once. The father is henceforward enabled to see and clear the way before his child, and give full scope to that disposition which God has assigned for the foundation of his conduct through life, and thus, too, is saved all the misery, seldom terminated before death, of a constant struggle against natural inclination. Besides, when once discovered, an original bent gives the father's hand a power of guidance, of which common-place minds do not allow: just such as the strong determined motion of the vessel supplies to the helmsman, whose skill is fruitlessly applied to a slow and placid course.

I now often pourtray to myself the high interest my father must have felt on seeing the different diverging roads on which our inclinations took us, as soon as the elementary acquirements, necessary to all dispositions, had been completed: how must our future destinations in life have forced themselves upon him, and how full of a fearful sense of responsibility, must he have laid hold of that handle of guidance which God had put into his hands. With all this he reposed great confidence in us (at least appeared to repose) regarding the moral nature of the book which we selected: he had, indeed, by unwearied instruction, by continual impression of God's word upon our minds, imparted to them a quick and nice distinction between good and bad, and relied upon our choosing the one and rejecting the other: like the parent bird, who having taught her brood their appropriate meats, dismisses them into the wide regions of earth and sky to choose for themselves. He did not therefore, officiously and ostentatiously guide our choice, for that he knew would be to thwart it, to damp the ardor of curiosity by prescribing a task, and above all, to deprive himself of the advantage of discovering our natural bias. But when I say this, I should, indeed, wrong him,

were I to assert that he exercised over our reading no control whatever; much, and very much, was done gently, indirectly, and in a manner imperceptible to ourselves. He had made, as I have said, scripture our well-head, and this important point secured, the guiding of the stream was managed by means so easy as to be apparently inadequate to the important effects required. Have you ever traced one of our first-rate rivers to its source? Then you cannot fail to have observed, how here a slight projection of rock has forced it to take an elbow, and saved it from the fate of a noisy brawling feeder to the nearest lake; and how there another obstacle, equally insignificant, has delivered it from being a nameless tributary to an obscure stream; and thus a series of causes, each apparently trifling when compared with the consequences, has ultimately shaped its course into a channel, which taking a sweep of rich and wide plains, and winding under the walls of historic towns and capital cities, supplies at last a haven for the commerce of the world, crowded and studded for many a mile with masts, sails, and flags, its joyous symbols. pp. 295—298.

The poetry of the volume is not the least entertaining and useful part of it. It is generally neat, apposite and spirited, and both serious itself, and calculated to enhance the effect of the serious representations in prose. Several of the pieces are very beautiful performances, and reflect the highest honor on the poetical talents of the writer. Among these we may name *Home*, the Comforter, *Thy Home*, *What is Affliction?* the Return, the Bride, the Early Tree, and the Widow. These, we should think, are more than "a bundle of wild plants which have sprung up in his fallow." They would seem to be more fitly compared to the choicest products of a flower garden. *Thy Home* we will give entire.

Where is thy home?—not where thy soul
Is joyous o'er the ruddy bowl,
Where harp and viol thro' the day
And down at night keep care at bay.
O heir of a most glorious sphere,
Look farther still—it is not here.

Where is thy home!—not where thy breast
With cold is numb'd, with hunger prest,
Ner day brings ease, nor night repose,
Morn opes with toils, eve shuts with woes.
O heir of a more glorious sphere,
Look farther still—it is not here.

Where is thy home?—not where all ranges
Threading a thousand dismal changes;
Where young grows old, and long grows brief,
Friend turns to foe, and joy to grief.
O heir of a more glorious sphere,
Look farther still—it is not here.

Where is thy home?—not where the breath
Thou scentest, every hour, of death,
And startest at the crashing sound
Of all thou lovest falling around.
O heir of a more glorious sphere,
Look farther still—it is not here.

Where is thy home?—not where to learn
Is but thy folly to discern,

And wisdom's privilege to know
A wider range of crime and woe.
O heir of a more glorious sphere,
Look farther still—it is not here.

Where is thy home?—not where thy heart
Hears earth's impatient cry, "depart,"
And all her shapes each moment say,
"Thou art a stranger; hence, away!"
O heir of a more glorious sphere,
Look farther still—it is not here.

Where is thy home?—where tear and groan,
And change and crimes are names unknown,
Where wisdom, pureness, bliss, are one,
And thou, no longer guest, art son.
O heir of an undying sphere,
No farther look—thy home is here:

The Widow is a story of some length, and very poetically told. Every reader, we doubt not, will be struck with its beautiful simplicity and pathos. The touching nature of the incidents, the purity of the sentiments, and the sweetness of the diction, render it indeed one of the chief ornaments of the volume. We offer from it two extracts below. The first commences with the widow's tale as given below.

I bore it patiently, methought, she cried,
My first affliction, when my husband died;
Of half my sublunary store bereft—
This would but render dearer what was left.
And after many a night of sorrow sore,
And many a page of holy writ turned o'er,
Prevail'd upon myself to term the woe
A mercy—but I could not feel it so—
Ordained to make me know the real worth
Of the all transitory bliss on earth;
To yield without complaint our Maker's due,
And bless the Giver and the Taker too.
But when that too, my last, my only joy,
That bliss unspeakable, my poor dear boy,
That solace of each week, and day, and hour,
That robb'd this world of care of half its power,
When that too went—forgive me mighty God—
I could not bow, I could not kiss the rod.
I term'd the visitation (weak and rash)
No sire's correction, but the tyrant's lash,
And, reckless of what further storm might burst,
Call'd day and night on him to do his worst:
All that before upheld me flung away,
And op'd that sacred volume—not to pray—
But smile in bitter scorn upon the leaf,
And mock the page that promis'd bliss to grief.
And when months their tedious course had run,
And woe diminish'd with each added sun,
Rebellion was unquell'd, maintain'd its part,
In a perverted head and callous heart.
'Twas then that good old man, so meek, so mild,
(He lies between my husband and my child,)

Your predecessor sought me out. . Severe
 The struggle was that he encountered here.
 But he prevail'd at length ; can I forget
 That blessed day—Oh no ! I feel it yet—
 When life and heat, launch'd forth in every strain,
 Thrill'd thro' my wither'd heart and bade it throb again ?
 When light pour'd in through my glaz'd eye at last,
 And I beheld, as in a dream, the past ?
 I found that I had center'd every joy,
 Each hope that heaven demanded, in my boy :
 An idol had been worshipping, which took
 From that great owner every thought and look.
 Now nothing interpos'd, and straight to heaven
 Each look ascended, and each thought was given.
 Hence patiently—but not without a tear—
 I look behind, and all before is clear.

pp. 226, 227.

The next extract is from the conclusion of her story, as she records the circumstances of the death of her boy, whose excess in study had produced a premature decay.

Ah ! who can tell what anxious mothers feel ?
 I watch'd his morning looks, I watched each meal,
 And oft at dead of night from bed I crept,
 Went to his door, and listened if he slept.
 And oh ! one night what agony was mine ;
 I heard him cough, and knew the fatal sign :
 The deep and melancholy murmur fell
 Upon my bosom, like his passing-bell.
 O night ! the last of hope, the first of fear,
 And even now, beyond all dreary, drear !
 Day after day I urg'd him, when at last,
 He found himself that life was ebbing fast.
 Surpris'd, as waken'd from a dream, he felt
 His limbs betray him, and their vigor melt ;
 Languid and listless o'er his books he bent,
 Weary and fainting on his walk he went :
 At last he said, confessing he was ill,
 " Do with me, dearest mother, as you will."
 From that same hour, invested with full share
 Of power to rule, I took him to my care ;
 His little study, source of all my pains
 And fears, I lock'd, and lock'd it still remains.
 Nor did he once inquire about his books,
 But gave me all his thoughts and all his looks :
 I felt that I had gained my son once more,
 My comforter, my comrade, as before.
 O God ! the short-lived joy but served to throw
 More bitterness amid my cup of woe :
 For, tho' I tendered all a mother's care,
 All human aid,—had Heaven agreed to spare ;
 And though he would not let a look betray,
 Yet did he waste and linger, day by day ;
 And, slowly as a snow wreath, melt away.
 But when at last he found concealment vain,
 For all announc'd the approaching end too plain,
 Oh ! o'er his wasted figure as I hung,
 God seem'd to gift him with an angel's tongue ;
 And planted powers of persuasion there,
 That might have sooth'd, if aught could soothe, despair.

Thus, for three months—but oh! excuse the rest,
 For crowding memory suffocates my breast.
 The look, the voice, to life's extremest goal,
 Beaming and preaching comfort to my soul—
 Preach comfort to these rocks!—Almighty God,
 Where do I run?—forgive—I kiss the rod.
 And tho' it long have crush'd me to the dust,
 'Tis but in joy to raise me:—thou art just.
 And thou, his minister, whom he hath led
 In charity, to cheer the Widow's shed;
 (Still, his chief mercies on the Widow rest,
 As when his Son the weeping Nainite blest;)
 Tho' the recall of things and times endear'd,
 Have wak'd old woes, yet, doubt not, I am cheer'd;
 In all my woes surpassing bliss I find,
 A bosom humbled, and a heart resign'd.

pp. 231, 233.

We should hardly do justice to the delightful theme, which has elicited the remarks already made, were we not to turn it to a more practical account than the entertainment of our readers, as a matter of criticism. We shall, therefore, offer to their consideration, consistently with the brevity we had imposed on ourselves, some thoughts on the general topic which the perusal of the book has suggested to our minds.

1. *The subject of a christian home, has not at large received that attention to which its importance entitles it.* A religious family, as before intimated, is here the brightest symbol of heaven, and the best place of preparation for its felicities. It is a little church of God on earth: and it has constituted a great charm of the volume under review, that this idea has been carried all along through its contents. But a christian home, however appreciated by a few who have enjoyed it, is unknown to the great body of men, even in protestant countries. How little of the spirit of Abraham and Joshua pervades, at this moment, the ranks of religious profession! Our pilgrim fathers entertained some just ideas on this subject, and put those ideas into practical operation. They found in their pious homes, though those homes were in a wilderness, an ample compensation for all their toils, dangers, and self-denial. To them, their families afforded a delightful resting-place, a holy calm, the pleasure of social worship, and the blessed employment of leading souls who were so dear to them, in the paths of truth and salvation. Their austerity, the fault of the age, is not proposed for our imitation; but their conscientiousness and fidelity to their charge, are worthy of all praise. Those families also, in which such men as Matthew Henry, Doddridge, Davies, Buchanan, Dwight, and others, were reared, doubtless felt the duty, and appreciated the privilege, connected with their station. And a goodly number of households, in every age of the church, have understood the design of God in the

domestic appointment, and acted accordingly. But the great body of nominal christian families, have given to this momentous interest, little thought, and less practical attention. Religion, however, can never signally flourish, nor the church of God realize its destined enlargement, until the subject of christian homes shall awaken a livelier concern, than now prevails throughout protestant christendom.

2. *The wisdom and goodness of God are admirably displayed, in the formation of the domestic life.* It would occupy a much larger space than is allotted us, even to present summarily the points, in which this arrangement manifests the divine attributes now named. We may say generally, that it constitutes a most striking indication of the wisdom and goodness of its author, considered whether as the source of human existence—as the nucleus of more extended society—as the conservator of the union of larger bodies—as the pervading, animating principle of all the forms of social life, from the highest to the lowest—as the nursery of virtue, intelligence, and refinement—as the chief seat of earthly happiness—as the place of recruit for the church of God—as the scene of preparation for the heavenly world. The domestic constitution is adapted, so to speak, with the nicest art, to answer its desired ends, in the training up of man for the employments of his entire being, and in bringing all that portion of nature with which he is associated, into subserviency to him: and if the happiest results, when the divine rule is observed in any good degree, can prove the wise and kind intentions of the contriver, then this proof is abundantly afforded. Nor is it the least of the manifestations of the divine skill and mercy, that in the very structure and tendencies of the household state—in the mutual wants, weaknesses, joys, sorrows, and duties of the inmates of every family, God has supplied the most urgent motives for obeying his rule, however frequently they violate it through the force of depravity. In their very situation, they have the greatest inducement for becoming, what they ought to become, in every instance, holy families. Our admiration and gratitude are unquestionably due to God, in view of that seal of his wisdom and goodness, which he has put upon the social organization of which we speak, and the more we contemplate it, the greater occasion we shall find for the exercise of those affections.

3. *The spirit of true religion invariably manifests itself, in efforts to promote household piety.* A child of God who has the charge of a family, will scarcely be contented without habitually attempting to make his home a christian, holy home. A flagrant neglect on this subject so necessarily opposes conscience—so effectually darkens the soul's prospects for eternity, and so constantly

resists the pleadings of natural affection, that a christian master of a family, can hardly be guilty of such a dereliction of duty for a long time together. He cannot be guilty of it with any degree of quiet. There is doubtless much deficiency in this department of christian obligation, and much sinful reluctance is felt in reference to an exemplary discharge of it, on the part of many who should feel otherwise; but so far as vital religion is in exercise, this will be one of the chosen forms of its manifestation. One of the first endeavors of consistent piety, in this case, will be to set up the order, the proprieties, the sacred and blessed rites of family worship and discipline. And he who makes no movement towards such an expression of his indebtedness to Christ, has reason to suspect the reality of his personal possession of grace. The strong feeling infused into the breast of every christian, for the immortal welfare of those whose character may be formed by his influence, especially of those directly committed to his care, must operate, more or less, in the production of efforts to discharge faithfully the duties of priest to his family, and to lead them in the way to heaven. There is, therefore, ample ground on which to expect, that every christian master of a household will attempt his appropriate duties, and on which he may be urged to the diligent performance of them.

4. *The christian home is a beautiful comment on the genius of the Gospel.* Christianity sanctifies and blesses man, not in his individual capacity alone, but as a social being. It has shed a holiness and beauty over all his social relations. In the domestic state, it has worked its loveliest transformation. The peace, contentment, intelligence, and purity of a christian home, are both an effect and image of the gospel of our salvation. That Gospel has saved myriads of families from becoming the victims of crime, ignorance, brutality, and wretchedness. It is destined yet to bless all the families of the earth—to redeem them all. If this religion be compared with other religions, in reference to its effects on the domestic constitution, it alone deserves our regards. It has made that constitution what it is. It originated it. Hallowing marriage,

“Perpetual fountain of domestic sweets,”

it has laid the foundation of that intellectual and moral worth, which attaches to christian households above all others. Under paganism and other false religions, woman, the ornament and soul of the domestic state, is shorn of her luster—an irremediable defect—an indelible disgrace, in the institutions of antiquity. We owe to the gospel that which gives to her and to home, a soothing, humanizing, transforming influence, like its own. The

gospel makes home, emphatically, the medium and the center of the immense variety of blessings, which it intended for the race. What, therefore, we find christian families to be, in worth of character, in sanctified attainments, in hopes, and in happiness—what as the incipient and lower, yet lovely church of God on earth—what as the sunny spots in the world's wilderness, reflecting the glory of God—such we shall find their great source and prototype to be, and vastly more. For beautiful, compared with other forms of excellence, as this comment is on the genius of christianity how imperfectly, after all, do the best trained christian households manifest the inherent, heavenly qualities of the gospel!

5. It will not be amiss if we insist, in conclusion, *on the duty and privilege of endeavoring to make our homes more nearly what they were originally designed to be, and through the gospel may still be, holy and happy homes.* How much holier and happier might they not be made, than they now generally are? How greatly might not even the best of them be improved in character and condition? In contemplating the model which has been furnished in the book under review, but one regret arises on the part of the conscientious head of a family, and this is, that he has performed no more faithfully the duty, and felt no more deeply the privilege connected with the station assigned him in his little church. The picture of a godly, devoted, praying head of a family, acting under a full sense of his responsibilities, and consecrating all his energies to the work of training up a beloved charge for God, if not heightened absolutely and in all its parts beyond the scope of mortality, cannot but be a severe rebuke to many of those who maintain the forms of religion in their households. But it may also be of great service to the interesting cause. It must excite a degree of regret for the past, but may awaken efforts for the future. While we cannot but lament that an amount of good might have been done which has been neglected—what opportunities of promoting the spiritual welfare of our families have been misimproved—what mistakes as to their moral discipline have been committed—what actual evil of a soul-ruining kind has been perpetrated, we shall be apt at the same time, to be stirred up by the winning exhibition of successful parental fidelity, to do better than they have done—to avoid errors formerly fallen into—and to seek with a livelier zeal the great end which can alone gratify the pious head of a household, viz. the blessing of God in a regenerated offspring. To such professors of piety as have just begun to be heads of families, and whose experience has not yet brought on them a sense of condemnation in this respect, it is a consideration of very special importance, how they shall train up

their families so as to escape the evils which many others have been constrained to deplore, and reap in full the benefits which the gracious constitution of God has conjoined with faithful parental labors. A consideration of this nature should be frequently held up to view, and the conviction should be fastened on all, that the responsibilities under which they act are amazingly great. How much in fact depends on them, in the providence of God, in regard to the character and destiny of their children and domestics; and how holy and happy might not their homes be made, by the exemplary performance of their duty! The question as to the degree in which the family institution shall answer its great object, as God designed it, can be solved by the experiment, undertaken in reliance on his blessing. To conduct the experiment fairly, would require such a cultivation of personal holiness, such a self-command, such a habit of spiritual observation, and such a diligence in improving the numberless occasions that offer, of instilling instruction into the minds of the young, as have been rarely seen in any heads of families, but ought to be found in all who bear the christian name.

ART. VI.—DIVINE PERMISSION OF SIN.

Reply to the Christian Spectator's Review of a Sermon on Predestination and Election. BY REV. W. FISK, author of the sermon. Christian Advocate and Zion's Herald. Vol. VI. No. 37.

Remarks on Rev. Dr. Taylor's Letter to Rev. Dr. Hawes. By BENNET TYLER, D. D.

Remarks on the Review of Dr. Fisk's Sermon, by Beza. Boston Telegraph. Vol. II. No. 23.

The Christian Spectator's Review of Dr. Fisk. Views in Theology. Vol. III. No. X.

IN our inquiries on the subject of predestination, we feel that we are creatures of yesterday, standing before the overshadowing glories of the Most High. We would cherish that reverence and godly fear which become those who are under the dominion, and in the presence, of an eternal King, whose purposes are adopted without the aid of any counselor, and carried forward, without disappointment, through every generation. We have seen how small a portion of his ways! We cannot stretch our thoughts over his vast kingdom, as it now is; much less, can we forecast the endless events which shall transpire, in it, during a coming eternity. Or if we attempt to scan the full intent and purpose of God, in relation even to one passing event, we fall back upon our own feeble powers in despair, with the exclamation of the apostle, "who hath known the mind of the Lord?"

Yet, though the Lord reminds us of his supremacy and our feebleness, that we may take the proper place of submission and reverence at his footstool, he invites us to search his ways ; and to examine with candor the evidences which he gives of wisdom and goodness in his proceedings, that we may exercise an intelligent confidence, submission, and joy in his government. What his purposes are, we can never know, except as they are revealed in his word, or are developed in their execution. Yet the *qualities* of his purposes, in which lies our chief practical concern, we have sufficient evidence to ascertain. If we did not, and could not, know whether "the mind of the Lord" is universally and unchangeably good and wise, our situation must unavoidably call forth far other emotions than those of reverence, confidence, and submission. To the destruction of every such feeling, our hearts must wither under a slavish dread and terror of the Almighty, too firmly seated for any command, declaration, invitation, or promise, from his mouth, ever to remove. We affirm, therefore, unhesitatingly, that reason is competent, from the evidence existing in known facts, to ascertain the grand qualities of the divine purposes ; and that the investigation most intimately concerns our practical duties.

In our review of Dr. Fisk's sermon, we accordingly said, that we should speak very frankly on the subject, and declare what, in our opinion, was demanded by the interests of truth and religion. We shall do so still, as we advance at the present time further in our inquiries ; for we feel that our footing is on the firm foundations of truth.

We have referred to the articles whose titles are given above, because they comprise all the notices we have seen taken of that review. It is not our design, however, to examine them otherwise than as the suggestions which they contain, may come under notice while pursuing the subject still farther than we did in our former review ; and while attempting, especially, to *vindicate the goodness of the purposes of God, in relation to the grand question of the entrance of sin into his kingdom.*

In that review we stated, that the purposes of God respect immediately his *own* agency in the universe ; and that his purpose to conduct his own measures in the particular manner he does, fixes the certainty of all events in his kingdom and all the conduct of his creatures.

There are three views, and only three, which can be taken of the divine purposes in relation to a moral kingdom :

1. That God, foreseeing the certainty of the conduct of his creatures, purposes, merely, to *treat them in a corresponding manner.*

2. That He, first of all, resolves *what the conduct of his creatures shall be*, and next resolves on such *measures as shall bring them to that conduct*.

3. That foreseeing the conduct which will certainly ensue on the different measures it is possible for Him to take, He purposes to *pursue those measures which will certainly lead to the best possible result*.

The first view is that which we understood to be advocated by Dr. Fisk in the sermon we reviewed. Our objection to it, is not that it is not true as far as it goes, but that it is utterly defective. The purpose of God to treat his subjects in a manner corresponding with their actions, we fully admit. God purposed to bless to eternity those holy angels, who he foresaw would persevere in holiness. He purposed to punish everlastingly those who he foresaw would rebel. He purposed to adopt in Christ as his children, those men who he foresaw would believe, and to punish with everlasting destruction those who he foresaw would not obey the gospel. Yet we affirm, that God not only entertains the purpose to *treat* his subjects according to their character, but also to regulate in the best manner possible, all that influence in his kingdom which *determines* character. God can vary his own acts in the creation of moral agents, and in his providence and government over them, in ways that are endless; and, as it is through these acts, that he controls and regulates the influence which determines character, he can vary that influence in ways as endless. We insist therefore, that God must have a *purpose* here. Reason as well as revelation decides, that his wisdom and goodness are concerned in his adopting that course of procedure in creation and providence, which will regulate, in the best manner possible, that influence in his kingdom which determines character. This is our objection to the first account of the divine purposes. It is utterly deficient. It passes over in silence, all that conduct of God which determines character. It consequently denies the foreordination of all events, and a determination of the persons who shall be believers in Christ. It leaves all this important interest in the kingdom of God, to pure contingency and unguided chance.

The second view of the divine purposes is the *supralapsarian*, and the one which we conceived to be unanswerably exposed to all the objections urged by Dr. Fisk. It is this; God purposes first what the conduct of his creatures shall be, and next what course he shall take in order to bring them to that conduct. On this scheme, the very first thing resolved on is, who among his creatures shall be holy and happy, and who shall sin and be miserable. It is unwarrantably *assumed* on this scheme, that the

whole ground was originally so clear from all obstacle or hindrance, arising from any thing in the nature of a moral universe, or the means which can be brought to bear on its welfare, that God might as the **VERY FIRST THING**, decide upon any conceivable results whatever by a bare act of volition; count up persons, more or less,—few, many or all—to be holy, and to be holy in any conceivable degree; without consulting his omniscience as to the necessary means and operations in his kingdom for securing the result. It is consequently *assumed* that his direct efficiency over his moral creatures, is such that he can rely on that *alone* to secure any conceivable result whatever: so that the ground is perfectly clear for him, in settling the plan of his moral kingdom, to say, as the very *first* thing, whether he will secure to holiness and happiness more or less, a part or the whole. Now to affirm that God, in *this manner*, selects a part for holiness and blessedness, and leaves the rest to sin and misery, is placing the subject on the ground of mere arbitrary will, beyond all retreat and salvo. It makes him choose, in *itself* and for its *own sake*, the sin and destruction of vast multitudes, rather than their holiness: there being, by the very supposition, no ground for it in the universe but his bare act of choice, since that act in fixing on persons is supposed to come in as the *first* thing in the order of nature, and not as a consequent on settling the best possible plan of operations in his kingdom. Besides: facts in the existing universe show, that ends are not reached in the moral kingdom of God, without the application of necessary means and measures; and consequently that the things must lie in the same relative order in the divine purposes,—that application of means and measures for the welfare of a moral kingdom which will secure the best results, must first be ascertained and settled by his omniscience, in order to invest his purposes with the attributes of wisdom and goodness.

The third view of the divine purposes is the *Infra lapsarian*, and the one on which our eye was distinctly fixed, and which we defended in our reasonings in our review of Dr. Fisk. It is this, God foreseeing the conduct which will certainly ensue on the different measures it is possible for him to take with a moral kingdom, purposes to pursue those measures which will secure the best possible result. This view presents God as foreseeing the results which different possible ways of conducting his own works will have on a universe of moral beings, and deciding on the best possible, as the *first thing*. It supposes that there may be obstacles, in the nature of a moral kingdom, which render it impossible for him to give universal efficacy to any original scheme of moral government, or subsequent scheme of redemption. It supposes, therefore, that as the first

thing, he decides upon that course of means and measures which he foresees will on the whole most overcome hindrances and carry holiness to the farthest extent possible, considering a whole universe in all ages. Such a purpose is, by consequence, the purpose of all that conduct in his creatures which is certainly to ensue. That is, the general purpose to use the power of moral government and redemption in the manner first seen to be the best possible, is, by consequence the specific election of Gabriel rather than Lucifer, and of Paul rather than Judas. Choice here, is not arbitrary. It is founded on the relation which the means he can employ in a moral kingdom bear to the nature and welfare of such a kingdom. It is choice falling in with the greatest reduction of evil and advancement of good, possible on his part. It is choice, therefore, perfectly consistent with his sincerely *desiring at heart* that all moral beings should voluntarily obey him on *their* part, and with his using the frank and open-hearted *expression* of that desire, in his law, as one of the very means he saw it best to incorporate into a system of measures designed to promote holiness in such a kingdom to the farthest extent possible. It is choice first taking counsel of benevolence and wisdom, and consequently adorned with these high attributes.

Adopting this view of his purposes, we rest their wisdom, and goodness, primarily, on this great fact: that he purposes to conduct his own works in the particular manner he does, in view of the results which will certainly ensue in his kingdom, and for the sake alone of the *good* which lies in these results, as being *the highest good he can secure*. Nothing is clearer than that he must foresee the results which would ensue from the works of creation and providence which he might adopt, in order to decide with any wisdom on his present works; and also that his heart must rest on the good which results from them in order to give his purposes the attribute of benevolence.

In stating that the purposes of God respecting his own conduct, fix the certainty of all events in his kingdom and of all the conduct of his creatures, we supposed, and we still suppose, that we upheld the fact of the foreordination of all events, and of the predestination of men to mercy and to wrath. He foreordains the existence of sin as really as the existence of holiness, and he predestinates to wrath as really as to mercy. The certainty of one is as really fixed by his purposes as the certainty of the other: for, while his purposes respect immediately his own conduct, in neither the sin or holiness of his creatures is any compulsive and irresistible force put upon their wills. Yet the fact of the foreordination of all events and of all the conduct of his creatures, is a thing distinct from the *end* which he has in view in that foreordi-

nation. In stating the end to lie wholly in the *good* results which are obtained, we deny, of course, that the foreordination of sin and wrath is founded at all on the evils themselves which are involved in the sin and misery of his creatures, and we fully imply that it is founded on the connection which, in some way, these evils unavoidably have with the holiness and happiness secured in his kingdom. For, the holiness and happiness secured in his kingdom, include all the good results which could have induced him to form his purposes, if his purposes are truly benevolent and good: and if these evils were not, in *some* way, unavoidably attendant on these good results, we can never vindicate the goodness of the divine purposes in suffering their existence.*

In what *way* are those evils connected with the good results secured by the divine purposes? This is the *great question*.

To this question three answers have been returned: † One is that these evils are a means of securing a higher good than could

* The preceding remarks furnish the substance of all which we have to say on the reply of Dr. Fisk. (1.) He asserts that we found our explanations of foreordination on principles which he acknowledges to be true and which he claims to be Arminian. In regard to the proper name to be given to these principles, we shall inquire afterwards. As to our agreement in them, we would merely ask: How is it possible to carry on a discussion to any advantage unless we go back and begin with principles in which the parties are agreed? It was surely our purpose to place this much contested doctrine on grounds which our Wesleyan brethren could not dispute, and it gives us pleasure to find that in this we have had complete success. (2.) He asserts that it is unfair in us to take up Arminian principles in a pretended defence of Calvinism and subversion of Arminianism. Now for names. But to be precise, we must look at things. There are *three* views which can be taken of the divine purposes, as we have suggested above; and for convenience we will refer to them by number. Dr. Fisk advocates I. and, by advocating it, denies the fact, that God foreordains all events. Dr. Fisk in his discourse, opposes II. We denied that the subject is placed in an alternative between I. and II. and we brought forward position III. which upholds the fact of foreordination in opposition to I, and upholds it free from the objections unanswerably opposed to II. Now since III. upholds the fact of foreordination free from the objections of Dr. Fisk, we have succeeded in upholding the very fact which Dr. F. as an Arminian denies and which Calvinists maintain. And what are the principles upon which we have sustained this issue? Why, we have begun with the very obvious facts that moral agents have the power of choice, and that their voluntary conduct is not the result of immediate propulsion or direct creation; things, whether called Arminian or not, which are admitted by the great body of the Calvinists. (3.) He asserts that it is an abuse of terms to call the permission of sin, not hindering it, etc., a foreordination or purpose that it shall be, and insists that purpose is like a legislative decree or effective ordinance which commands a thing to be done. Yet who ever upheld the foreordination of sin, in any such sense? Besides: if an evil, unavoidable and hateful, is allowed by the Creator to come into his kingdom in one place and time *rather than any other*, and is thus *particularly disposed of* by his providence because it is a disposition of it the best possible, is there no purpose of God in relation to the thing? In doing his own pleasure in this case, does he not decide on the fact of the entrance of sin into his kingdom just when and where it enters?

† Some have entirely refused an answer to this question; asserting, that the subject is at present an unexplained and inexplicable mystery.

exist in a kingdom of pure holiness and blessedness, and that, therefore, God leads off some of the holy into sin by a special arrangement of providence for the purpose.* Another is, that these evils result, with certainty, from placing creatures in conditions in which they may obtain a higher degree of holiness, if they will, than they possibly could in conditions which would insure universal holiness.† The other is, that these evils arise from the nature of a moral universe itself, and are limited and regulated by the present scheme of providence, so as, in the result, to gain the *highest proportional amount* of holiness and blessedness, and to reduce sin and punishment to the *least proportional amount*, which is possible.

The two first answers proceed on the ground that a universe *can* be kept holy by God, to all eternity; and that he has actually *rejected* such a universe, as a *possible thing*, and preferred before it a universe, marred by sin, for the sake of a higher good than is possible in a holy universe. The last answer proceeds on the supposition, that a universe cannot be kept holy to all eternity, and that consequently God has never actually rejected such a universe as a possible thing; but that in a universe from which sin cannot be excluded, he has simply preferred to order his works of creation and providence, in such a manner as to reduce the evil to the *least proportional extent possible*, rather than order them in any other manner.

We have averred that the first reason which has been assigned cannot be proved to be true, and that the last *may* be true. We have asserted that on the supposition it is true, the doctrine of the divine purposes can easily be vindicated from the objections which have been derived from the existence of sin. We have accordingly framed our explanations of the divine purpose on that very supposition, and have convincingly shown, as we think, that against such an explanation none of the objections can hold. Nor is it at all necessary in removing the objections of the infidel, that we should positively assert, and convincingly prove, that this is the true reason. It is enough to show that his objections proceed on the first reason wholly; that they can have no existence or force at all on the last; and that for aught he can urge in favor of the first or against the last reason, the last may be the true one. We throw it wholly on him to disprove the last, if he would any longer retain or urge his objections; and there we justly leave him, without excuse, until he shall bring his demonstration.

When we assert, that the reason for the divine foreordination of

* Beza.

† Author of Views in Theology.

sin *may* be, that as to God's prevention it is an unavoidable attendant on a moral universe, or on the kind of good which God seeks in his purposes, we do not advocate "the doctrine," ascribed to us by the author of *Views in Theology*, "that God cannot prevent us from sin in the instances in which we transgress." The reason which we alledge is predicated of nothing short of a *whole universe of moral beings for eternity*—that in such a universe sin is not wholly avoidable, by any scheme of creative and providential acts on the part of the Creator. If, therefore, the question is raised: why does the Creator permit sin to come into a moral universe at all? The proper answer, on the supposition we have made, would be this: He cannot so overrule such a universe but there shall be occasion of its entering at least some where, and at some period. But if the question is raised, in the particular form to meet existing cases of transgression: Why does he permit sin to come into the present universe, just *when* and *where* he does? The answer, (though ultimately founded on the same general reason,) would not be that he cannot prevent it in *these particular* cases by changing the course of his providence;* but simply this: that the course of providence which he is now pursuing and which reduces the occasions of sin exactly within their present limits, is the best he can adopt with reference to the welfare of the universe for eternity. Any change by which the occasions of existing sin would have been prevented, would involve with it a course of providence, less happy in its final bearing on the interests of holiness and happiness in his kingdom; less happy in limiting and overruling the occasions of sin which, on the change, must *elsewhere* arise in his kingdom.

When we vindicate the goodness of the divine purposes on this ground, it cannot be supposed, that we think the position itself is altogether void of probability. We have indeed asserted no more than its possibility;† and, like a possible quantity, we have assum-

* Yet the author of *Views in Theology* has attempted to refute the position, as if it were ours, that God could not prevent sin from taking place just *when* and *where* it does. If we should say of an artificial basin which should be constructed to receive the water of a rivulet, that it cannot possibly be constructed without flowing beyond the embankment somewhere, and should assign this as the fundamental reason for constructing a waste way, would this be equivalent to asserting, that the *particular outlet* which was provided by the engineer, and which turned off the waters in the best possible direction, *could not possibly be prevented*? We have simply founded the perfections of the present scheme of providence (in its relation to sin) on its reaching the utmost proportional limits of prevention possible, with reference to a *whole universe for eternity*.

† The injustice of which we have complained in the Letters of Dr. Woods to Dr. Taylor is, that he holds Dr. Taylor responsible for advocating that as positively true, which he, suggesting as possible, had called on Dr. Woods or others to disprove.

ed it to work out our process of explanation and vindication. Yet we hold, there are strong probabilities in the case, that we have not assumed a wrong quantity. We will venture therefore, in the present article, to advance the probabilities which in our view, favor the position, that sin arises out of the nature and circumstances of a moral universe—or that the providence and moral government of the Creator, having respect to beings who *can* sin as well as obey, are not effectual to secure universal and endless holiness in such a universe.

The position we apply to *moral beings*. We affirm that they, in their very nature, are capable of exerting wrong as well as right choices; that they are endued with susceptibilities to temptation as well as to holy influence; that they have a limited personal good within reach which occasions temptation, as well as the general good which serves, as an honorable and worthy motive to benevolence and virtue.

Again: we apply the position to a *universe* of moral beings for *eternity*. We affirm, that the causes in *kind* which originate sin, being inseparably inherent in a moral universe, may so accumulate in *degree*, under every system of providence and government which can be pursued, as to render sure the occurrence of sin. If, in a universe of such beings, no possible system of providence adopted and pursued through eternity, can shut out all occasions of the outbreakings of sin, it is easy to see, that as to his preventing it, sin is unavoidably incidental to the acts of the Creator in creating and governing such a kingdom.

Such is the meaning which we affix to the position. The probabilities which we urge in favor of its truth, are the following.

I. The causes in *kind* which are known to originate sin in the present universe, *must necessarily be present in any possible universe of moral beings*.

The things to which we allude, are, the power of choosing, susceptibility to mere personal enjoyment, and the presence of objects which administer to that enjoyment. These things in kind, are necessarily attached to the very existence of a system of moral beings. Because beings without the power of choice, would not be moral beings, neither fit subjects of law nor capable of sin or holiness; and beings unsusceptible to personal enjoyment and unconnected with any objects of it, could have no demonstrations of the goodness of God, nor any opportunity of rational and holy choice in preferring the Creator to the creature, or in confiding any interests of their own to the regulation of God rather than of themselves. The power and opportunity of holy choice—the choice involved in the very existence of holy love and submission to God,—implies, necessarily, the presence of the things

we have named in every system of moral beings which can be created. There can be no system of moral beings instituted, therefore, into which the things we have named do not enter, as necessary, inseparable ingredients. And that these things in *kind*, give rise to the occurrence of both temptation and sin in such beings, we have the resistless demonstration of facts. They have done it in the present universe, under the present providence of the Creator.

If the causes of defectibility are thus inseparable from the existence of a universe of moral beings, is there not a ground of probability that they will lead to actual defection in every possible system as well as in this? Do the perfections of God demonstrate *a priori* that this cannot be, and thus exclude all probability from such a source? We reply, that the ground of probability remains still, not destroyed by the fact that the intrinsic perfections of God are infinite. For, his perfections, if employed on a moral system, are employed on a material in its own nature defectible; and demonstrate no more, than that he will obtain that result which is the best possible, taking into consideration both his own perfections and the nature of the material on which they are employed. The power of God in this case, is relative: relative, not to mere passive objects of physical omnipotence, but to free moral agents; and relative, not to a given individual for a limited term of existence, but to a *universe* of moral beings *through eternity*. This very obvious idea of power, on which the whole subject turns, seems not to have been regarded by Dr. Woods, in his discussion of this subject and his attempted analysis of power contained in his Letters to Dr. Taylor. At least in all that he says of the power of God and the nature of things, he does not seem to glance at this idea of power as relative, not to an individual, or a part, but to the complex whole of a moral system, and to the whole, not for a limited period, but to eternity. Nor does he seem to apprehend that a moral universe has necessarily any nature of a definite kind, under the necessary bounds and limitations of which the works of God must be employed, if employed on a moral universe at all. We hold that there are things essential to constitute a moral being: that whatever endless diversity may be given to the capacities and circumstances of individual moral beings, yet that in order to constitute them moral beings at all, certain things in kind are fundamental, without the existence of which, they would not be qualified to enter at all into the responsibilities, the duties, the joys of such beings. And more than this, we hold that into these very essentials of moral agency, there enter inseparably, the kinds of causes which are known to originate sin. Now if this is true—and that it is we have evidence in facts, too clear and satisfactory to resist—

if this is true, then we know, that God in choosing to exert his agency on such a system, exerts it under limitations rendered necessary by the system itself. For instance; if he chooses to *create* moral beings, his act of creation is placed under the necessary limitations which arise from the essential nature of moral beings, i. e. he cannot create them, without conferring on them powers, capacities, gifts, of such a *kind* as constitute a real moral agent, which by necessity involve the known causes of sin. And if over any creation of such beings he should begin and pursue any method of *providence* and *government*, it is clear that the causes which originate sin would still exist, in kind, under his providence. And, since under any system of providence, the condition of his creatures must be constantly changing—as it is demonstrable that a moral universe could not be kept by any system of providence in one immoveable, quiescent, *petrified* state of intellect and feeling—as moral beings must act, under any providence, and their very actions, if nothing else, must change their own conditions and the conditions of those around them,—it is clear, that among these fluctuations, there may arise conjunctures in his kingdom, under any providence, in which temptations will rise and prevail to the overthrow of some of his creatures. Different schemes of providence might throw these conjunctures into different parts or periods of his kingdom; some might render them less disastrous in themselves than others; some throw them where they might be better overruled to the subsequent good of his kingdom through punishment or redemption: but where is the evidence that any scheme of providence could wholly avert the evil, when it is the necessary condition of a moral universe, under any providence, that the causes in kind which are known to originate sin are present, and that they are changing in the bearing they have on the degree of temptation? Nor is this subject met at all by such questions as these; with which the writer above named has attempted to dispose of it: Is not God the Creator of the mind? does not he give things their nature? would he give his creatures a nature which he could not control? For, what force do these questions carry with them, when applied to a *moral universe*? a thing which necessarily has a *definite nature*, and a nature which involves causes which under any scheme of providence may unavoidably occasion sin? Our answer to such questions, therefore, would be the following. Is not God, the Creator of the universe? We have no doubt of it. Does not he give things their nature? Our answer here, must vary with the construction that is given to the question. If you mean whether, by an act of creation, he can give existence to a being who has the endowments essential to a moral agent as well

as give existence to animals, or vegetables, or any other natures : we answer, yes. If you mean whether he can connect, with the essential requisites of moral agency, the varieties of capacity and circumstance which distinguished Gabriel and Adam at their creation, or which distinguish the children of Adam from one another, or even still greater varieties : we answer, undoubtedly. But if you mean whether by mere appointment he can change or alter the things in kind which are essential to moral agency, and make one a moral agent without any intellect, and another without any feeling or susceptibility to happiness, and another without any power of choice : we answer, No ; *most assuredly not* ; the nature of the subject forbids.

Now to the next question. Would he give to his creatures a nature which he could not control ? Under the limitations which we have already thrown around the question, it amounts simply to this : Would he give existence to beings of a moral nature, if their nature involved the existence of things which might, under every possible system of providence that he could adopt, become sources and occasions of sin ? i. e. if he could not so control them as to prevent all sin ? We reply, yes, certainly, *if their nature involves this*, because he *has* given existence to such beings. And we add still farther, that if the nature of a moral universe involves intrinsically in it this certainty of moral evil, it is no impeachment of the perfections of God, that he employs his power on a universe subject in its own nature to these conditions. For this is no proof that he has not selected, in a moral universe, the best materials in kind, for the production of happiness ; or that he does not manage it for that end, in the best manner which the material allows, or which his perfections can provide. The question, therefore, after all, returns, unanswered through this ordeal ; Does the nature of a moral system give rise, under any possible providence, to the certainty of evil ? There is a possibility that it is even so, because the same things in *kind* which originate sin in the present universe, must necessarily exist in every possible universe.

We urge as an additional source of probability, that the occasion of sin is founded in the very nature of a moral universe ;

II. That sin in the present universe has originated from such causes in kind as are inseparable from the existence of moral agents, *notwithstanding God has put forth no acts for the sake of leading his subjects into sin rather than holiness.*

Sin is not an object for the production of which he has put forth any acts. His acts of *creating* such beings and *upholding* them, terminate solely on their *existence*. And although in giving them, and in continuing to them their existence, the causes which give origin to sin are brought into existence, yet they are

so unavoidably : because they are inseparable from the very nature of moral beings. These acts then,—though terminating on the existence of beings capable of choice and susceptible to mere personal enjoyment as well as the good of others,—have never been put forth for the sake of introducing sin rather than holiness. For, the proper end of such beings lies in the noble employment of voluntarily serving God, instead of their own lusts ; and the act of God in giving them existence, can never justly or without impiety, be alledged as the cause of their ever consenting and choosing to serve their own lusts rather than God. Again ; God's acts of *providence* over such beings have placed them in conditions, in which the sources of temptation have borne upon them with different degrees of strength ; yet never has he, in placing them in their different conditions of trial, had this end in view—to solicit and persuade them to sin rather than holiness. However strong a temptation may have arisen in heaven, at that juncture in his providence when some of the angels rebelled, or in Eden when our first parents fell, or at any period previous in the history of either ; his providence was not ordered in the manner it was, for the sake of persuading either to sin. For evidence of this, we have his positive disclaimer, pronounced by an apostle who spake under his inspiration :* and the history of his providence, to which we have referred, exhibits nothing discordant with this testimony. Nor in his acts of *moral government*, has he ever implanted any conscience, published any law, or uttered any encouraging promise or fearful threatening, for the sake of conducting his creatures into sin. Conscience is a monitor of duty, not an enticer. “The law was ordained for life”—intended only to preserve and promote holiness, adapted to secure the everlasting life of the moral creation.

If then no acts of God are justly chargeable with being put forth for the sake of introducing sin into his kingdom, but, on the contrary, have all been put forth to promote holiness ; and if, nevertheless, from such causes in kind, as necessarily pertain to a moral system, sin has actually originated among his creatures ; is there no probability that such causes lay a foundation for the occurrence of sin, which is unavoidable by any scheme of providence on the part of the Creator ? Since sin must originate either from God himself or from his creatures, the proof that no acts of God over the present universe are designed and ordered for the sake of introducing sin, amounts to a demonstration, that sin, in the present universe at least, under the present providence of God, has origina-

* James, I. 13.

ted with his creatures. The question is therefore reduced to this ; Is it probable, if any scheme of providence could be adopted with a moral universe which would forever prevent the rise of prevailing and destroying temptations, and retain the whole in everlasting holiness ; is it probable, that a God who does nothing for the sake of introducing sin into his creation, would yet have adopted, in preference to that scheme, a scheme like the present, which, upon that supposition, must have opened to the universe all the present occasions of prevailing temptation ? Would he have allowed all these occasions of offense to come into his kingdom, if there were at the outset of his providence, no ' needs be : ' but a clear method of escape, and of carrying forward a system of order and devoted and holiness and rapturous joy throughout his whole moral creation, uninterrupted through eternity ? Would he turn away his eyes and heart from securing so fair a heritage, and allow rather the elements of disorder, rebellion, selfishness, malice, blasphemy, pain, to sweep through his empire, like a destructive whirlwind, inflicting wide-spread and to a great extent irreparable and everlasting injuries ? Is it not more honorable to a God of benevolence, who can find no gratification himself, nor give his kingdom any, in the everlasting desolations of sin, to assert of Him, that as the very elements of ruin are necessarily involved in the existence and nature of his kingdom, the storm of ruin must sweep over it ; and that he has determined, in the chariot of his providence, to ride in the whirlwind and the storm Himself ; and direct it, in its entrance and course, where it can do the least harm and where its injuries can be farthest repaired ? But here the opponents of the position which we are defending as probable, meet us with the assumption, that the perfect and everlasting holiness of a universe of moral beings, is *one* good which it is possible for God to secure, but not the *highest* good. But we throw back the assumption with the demand, that they should first resolve the question : How do you demonstrate that, with *such a material as a moral universe*, (in which the things in kind which occasion sin are necessarily present, and which things have risen up into occasions of prevailing temptation and sin under the present providence of God, which has never been administered for the sake of introducing sin,) it is *possible* to obtain such a result as the perfect holiness of the *whole* to all *eternity* ? Unless that is first demonstrated to be a possible good, you cannot affirm the fact that in his counsel the Creator compared *that* at all with the present, or that in his purpose he rejected *that* at all for the present : For, it was among the goods *possible* for him to *obtain* in such a kind of universe, and not the goods of which his own mind could *conceive* merely ; it was, we say, among *possibles* and not mere *conceivables*, that his comparison and choice ranged, in fixing

on the *best possible*. But these opening thoughts respecting the highest *possible* good, advance us one step forward in the chain of probabilities which we claim for our position. We advance it, therefore, as a ground of probability that the certainty of sin is found in the very nature of a moral universe ;

III. That sin has originated in the present universe from those causes in kind which are inseparable from the existence of a moral universe, notwithstanding God has so ordered his providence over it *as to secure the highest good possible*.

Respecting the fact that God has ordered his works in the existing moral universe in such a way as to secure the highest good which it is possible for him to secure, we and the parties who hold controversy with us on the question under discussion, are at least fully agreed. And if any others deny it, and maintain that God could secure a higher *kind* of good than that which is appropriate to moral beings, or that he could carry that kind of good to a further *extent* than he does, in the present universe, they deny the fact that his benevolence is *perfect*, or so strong as to move him to do all the good that is in his power : and we will not turn aside to hold any controversy with them. Now the position, on which we agree, that God, in the present universe, is securing the highest good possible, involves the fact that certain *limits* are set up, either by the nature of God himself, or by the nature of a moral universe, *beyond* which he *cannot* carry that *kind* of good which pertains to a moral system. We may suppose it possible for Him to adopt an almost endless variety of plans of good, which carry up the good to as great a variety in degree and amount ; but, when we speak of the highest possible amount and admit that there is such a thing, we come up to ultimate barriers and boundaries, beyond which it is impossible for Him to go in advancing that good. Now as God himself is a being of unlimited nature and perfection, He must be competent, surely, to carry up the good of a moral universe to as high an amount as the nature of such a universe admits. It is evident therefore that the limits of possibility in this case are affixed by the nature of a moral universe itself. If then the nature of a moral universe is such, as to affix limits to the amount of good which God can secure, it does in fact define the limits of the good which on the present plan of his works he is securing. That is : He is now securing the highest amount of moral good which the nature of a moral universe admits. Is there not then a high probability in the fact, that sin has come into the present universe, and broken the ranks and interrupted the progress of universal holiness, and introduced a wide and to a great extent irreparable calamity ; and that it is known and seen to have come in from causes which in kind pertain to the very nature of a moral universe ; is there not a

high probability, we ask, in this fact, that the universal and uninterrupted progress of the whole universe in holiness and to all eternity is merely a conceivable good, which the very nature of a moral universe puts beyond the range of possibility? Why have we not come here to one of the very barriers and limits, which the nature of a moral universe affixes to good that is possible, viz. the inherent defectibility of a moral universe throwing it beyond possibility for God to secure by his works, such a conceivable good as the universal and uninterrupted progress of a whole universe of moral beings in holiness to all eternity? All the known facts in the case correspond with the supposition. For, we have just that kind of causes necessarily involved in a moral universe, which would serve to put that conceivable good beyond the limit of possibility. We have just that kind of result in the present universe in the actual inroads and desolations of sin, which would be expected were that good beyond the limit of possibility. We have just the kind of measures taken in punishment and redemption to raise up mounds against the further progress of sin and to recover from its wastes and desolations, which, if that good were in fact beyond possibility and the inroads of sin in a moral universe were unavoidable, would be expected of one who was aiming to do the highest *possible* good towards such a universe, and who had the *power* to punish and redeem; because the exercise of this power, on that condition, would certainly conduce to advance the good and lessen the evil in such a universe.

Is not, then, that conceivable good beyond the limit of possibility to the Creator? All the known *facts* in the present universe, are just such in *kind* as would exist, were that conceivable good, conceivable merely, and beyond the possibility of attainment by the Creator. This is the amount of the probability we urge, that it is impossible.

They who affirm that it is possible, have never proved that affirmation. They have never resolved the endless problem which requires solution. They have not pointed out a particular way in which the Creator's works over such a kind of universe may be conducted, in all their complex parts, in relation to each and the whole, from the outset down through everlasting ages, so that it will be morally certain, that the whole universe will persevere and advance in holiness to all eternity, notwithstanding the causes necessarily inherent in it from which sin may originate. The affirmation respects the complex whole; involving illimitable terms to the moral beings who may be created and to the duration of their existence.

Now they who affirm that a thing can be done, are bound to show how the thing can be done, or to point to a case where the

like is done. They cannot show how it can be done. They cannot point to a case in which it is done. In the present system, the like has not been done. Do you point us to heaven and holy angels? But they are but a part of the complex whole, and their holiness was confirmed only through the very trial in which multitudes of their companions fell. You are, in this case, like persons, unskilled in mechanics, standing before a piece of metallic machinery, too complex in its parts and carried through too long and intricate a chain of dependence for them to comprehend: who, observing, from the known conditions under which the whole exists of expansibility in the material and change of temperature, that expansion in one part rises into an actual evil, while no such evil is seen to rise from those causes in other parts, should therefore affirm, that the kind of evil they witness was wholly avoidable in the system, and should consequently infer, that it was introduced by the artist for the sake of gaining a better result. Would you not say with propriety to the ignorant examiner: Wait, till you can show how such a material as metal, while subject to the conditions of expansion and change of temperature, can be constructed into a machine which will gain such a result and this kind of evil be avoided; or, if you are incompetent to do this, wait at least till you can point to some particular instance where this is done,—before you make your hasty assertion of the possibility of it, and proceed, (on the ground that it is possible,) to your hasty inferences about the intention of introducing the evil as a means for gaining a better result.

Here we might justly leave the argument with the assertion, that they who affirm the continual progress in holiness of a whole universe to all eternity to be a thing possible for God to secure, affirm without proof, and leave, untouched, the grounds of probability we urge that the thing transcends the limits of possibility. But, since they who affirm this,* as we have already suggested, bring forward their theories to account for the admission of sin into the universe, we are disposed to inquire whether those theories can be sustained, or be justly urged in objection to the conclusion to which we have come.

The two theories advanced by our opponents, proceed mutually on the one basis, that God has neglected works which would have conducted the whole universe to all eternity in the increasing joys of holiness, in order to avoid a *necessarily inferior* good; and that he has adopted others which secure sin in the universe, in preference, in or-

* At least, all who resolve not the whole subject into an inexplicable mystery and debar themselves of the right of either affirming or denying.

der to gain a *superior* good. They differ, one from the other, in relation to that which constitutes the superior good of the system adopted : one making it to consist in the introduction of acts of punishment and redemption into the universe, for the introduction of which the occurrence of sin is indispensably necessary ; the other, making the superior good to lie in God's ordering the conditions of his creatures so, that if they obey they will secure the highest good and at the same time in that even balance, that if they sin he will secure an equal good ; and sin occurs merely as a consequence of those conditions.

Let us take the first theory. This theory is rested, by its advocates, on the facts, that the justice of God in the punishment of sin and the mercy of God in redemption are actually contributing, and greatly, to the amount of good in this universe. The facts to which they refer we as fully admit as they : viz. that God is punishing some of the wicked and redeeming others, and that these acts of justice and mercy are actually conducing to the welfare of this universe. Yet we deny that these acts contribute to the good of the universe in the *way* which they represent.

The acts of God in punishing and redeeming, are represented by the advocates of this theory, as contributing to the good of the present universe in this way ; that they render it a *happier* universe than it *could be* if *all its inhabitants were continued and advanced in holiness forever*. This is the manner in which they interpret the value of those acts. They have a value, say they, independently of the occurrence of sin in any beings, or any grounds and occasions for its occurrence. They have a value in merely making an exhibition of justice and mercy, which exhibition, they alledge, would be forfeited, if God should so order his kingdom as to prevent all sin and keep all forever pious and benevolent and happy. To secure this exhibition, he himself, without any grounds for the occurrence of sin in the nature of a moral kingdom, purposely interrupts the holy devotedness of his subjects, and leads off multitudes into rebellion. This interpretation of the acts of punishment and redemption, we contend, is false ; and we urge another interpretation, which, we contend, is the true one : viz. that these acts render the universe as a whole, *less sinful* and *miserable*, as well as *more holy* and *happy*, than without them it *would be*. They are valuable only with reference to the grounds which exist in the nature of all moral agents for the occurrence of sin, and after occasions of rebellion and sin have arisen on these grounds. They are valuable *at that time*, because they continue in force over those who remain in holiness, the authority of that law which was originally "ordained unto life," i. e. as a necessary means for controlling the self-tendencies of such beings and preserving them in holiness ;

and also to recover, in a way which may not impair that authority, sinners from the ranks of rebellion, and unite them to the ranks of the holy in piety, benevolence and happiness forever.

Which of these interpretations is true? Is it the intention of these acts to render the universe happier than a fancied universe of perfectly devoted and holy beings could be; or is it, to render a defectible universe, when sin occurs in it, less sinful and miserable than it otherwise would be? Let us try that question, on which the whole subject turns.

All the *analogies* which have come to our knowledge in human governments, concur in representing the design and value of punishment, and reclaiming and forgiving mercy, to be precisely that which we alledge. Human governments that are righteous and good, seek the order and happiness of all over whom they are appointed. They never punish till an individual has forfeited his happiness under a penalty which was originally instituted as a means of protection to the whole. They never think of luring off subjects into crimes, and punishing them for the sake of having a better community than one of universal order would be. They never think, when offering amnesty and seeking returning allegiance among the revolted, that they recur to such a means for the sake of having a happier kingdom than one could be in which revolt should never take place. They punish, to keep the arm of righteous authority upon, and hold far back, those very self-tendencies in all, which, in the criminal, have led him recklessly to trample down the barriers of peace and order. They reclaim and forgive, (when they can do it and not incur an equal calamity elsewhere,) in order to relieve from misery and re-unite to the privileges of the kingdom those who, without the act, must inevitably be destroyed or suffer the misery of imprisonment or exile. The necessity of these acts, does not arise from the mere voluntary intention of having a happier kingdom or community, than a fancied one of perfect order. Their value lies solely in their tendency and efficacy to diminish evil. The necessity is more deeply laid in the defectibility of all, and the unavoidable occurrence of crime in some. Do you tell us, that these governments are administered by man, a mere creature? Very well. The reins of this imperfect government are in the hands of man. But then the perfect government which is in the hands of the infinite God, is administered over the very same beings and others necessarily of the same essential properties.

From analogies we turn next to the *scriptures* to inquire what is their *testimony, respecting the value* which these acts bear to his kingdom. Is it, that they secure a different kind of kingdom from one of universal and endless holiness? Or is it, that, in the existing state to

which his kingdom comes through temptation and sin, these acts are introduced benevolently, to check the inroads of sin and redeem from its wastes ; and thus to render his kingdom less sinful and miserable, and more holy and happy than, *having come to that state*, it would otherwise be? We venture to assert, that not a single scriptural testimony or allusion which bears on the value of these acts, can be found, which ever carries us back for the terms of the comparison beyond *his kingdom in that state in which it was when sin had occurred* ;—which carries us back to his kingdom in its *previous holiness*, or to a *fancied kingdom of perfect holiness by its side*. The comparison of the scriptures is ; his kingdom as it was *when sin had entered it*, and *would henceforth be without these acts*, compared with what his kingdom is now or will be in eternity under these acts. Thus punishment is represented as always called for by the occurrence of sin, and not by any thing else. God charges on sinners the guilt of having given occasion for his judgments. The work is one, he most solemnly affirms, in which his soul has no pleasure. He urges those who have sinned and exposed themselves to punishment, to whom he offers pardon through Christ, that they turn from sin and live. He mourns over the loss of those who would none of his counsel. And when his hand taketh hold on vengeance, he calls them enemies who would not have him to reign over them and control them by his law ; and before his witnessing kingdom, he commissions the executioners of wrath to slay them, that all may know the grounds and terrors of his judgments, and fear to sin. If he exhibits his righteousness in judgment, this is the exhibition. If he promotes his glory, this is his glory. While punishing the really guilty before his kingdom and exhibiting his determination to uphold his law, they see, and exclaim ; Righteous are his judgments ! Who should not fear to sin against thee, O Lord ? Their songs, as at the Red sea, over the overthrow of the enemies of God, take their date no farther back than to the sin and to the acts of malevolence and impiety, which call for righteous vengeance.

All the love of God in redemption, on the other hand, when its value and results are told, takes its date no farther back than the fall and sin of the world. He gave his Son for the world, when *lost*, that they might not *perish* but have eternal life. This, according to the apostle, is the great love of God, who is rich in mercy, that those whom he *saw dead in trespasses and sins* he quickened and raised together with Christ, with the intention of uniting them to his kingdom in eternity, holy and unblamable in love. If angels see this love in redemption and rejoice in it, their joy arises from witnessing what it does, in bringing up his kingdom from that state in which it was when they mourned over the rebellion of

this world. It is joy over spirits ransomed from sin and hell, and now forever happy and safe in the kingdom of holiness. 'These holy, happy spirits are here with us for eternity,' say they, 'who but for the redeeming grace of God, had been forever in that pit of darkness and smoke and blasphemy and pain. We praise God for it, and the Lamb that was slain.' If there is *love* in redemption, it is here. If it is *seen*, it is seen only here. If God *exhibits* it, he exhibits it only by thus exercising it towards the guilty and the lost for their recovery, in the view of his witnessing kingdom. The songs of the redeemed and angels in praise of ransoming grace, go no farther back than to that state of his kingdom in which sin had entered it, and the guilty were forever lost and wretched without that interposition. Why then,—and we wish this question to be thoroughly pondered,—why do not the scriptures celebrate the acts of God in punishment and redemption, as valuable and glorious *on this account*; viz. that by these acts he has brought up his kingdom, to its existing state, from its *original state of holiness*, and from the state it would have attained *had that holiness continued uninterrupted*, if, as is pretended, the chief value of these acts lies, and is seen, only in *this* comparison? The comparison of God and the holy in heaven, by which their estimate of these acts is weighed, lies, between the universe in the state to which he will now bring it through these acts, and the state into which it was brought by sin, and would have been brought had sin remained unpunished and no sinners been reclaimed. The comparison of heaven, is placed between these limits. God and the holy, who enjoy all the good of this universe, place it only here. They are not forever calling into view a fancied state of universal and uninterrupted holiness, in order to take the dimensions of their materials of joy. They put that forever out of the question. The metaphysics of a *holy universe rejected, and a universe marred by sin preferred before it*, find no place there.

But we turn from this heavenly testimony, given in revelation, to the direct value of the acts of punishment and redemption. We will now inquire, whether there is *any thing in the manner in which sin has entered into the universe* and presented occasion for these acts, which goes to show, that God himself has rejected an eternally holy universe, as one possible good, for the sake of having a different universe in which he might introduce these acts. Understand the question under these limitations: Does the *manner* in which sin has entered the universe *show*, that God could have secured a *whole universe for eternity in holiness*? Of the angels we know little; of our first parents and their race, more. But from the facts that are stated, we affirm, that they are such as can be solved only on the supposition, that God, without the original design to

introduce sin into a moral universe, has yet so ordered his providence as to throw the occasions of it, where he might introduce acts to diminish the evil. We will look, as we know the most about it, to the case of our first parents. Now that God did not entertain the original design to introduce sin himself, we have these circumstances to prove. He did not create them sinners. He did not create their sin when they fell. He did not give them law with penalty annexed, to make up an occasion for punishment. He did not render them physically incapable of obedience. He did not order their condition of trial, as a solicitation on his part that they should sin rather than overcome. He did not institute in them the parental relation, in order that they might hand over a legacy of sin and woe, rather than of holiness and joy, to their children. They had ability to obey, and the opportunity of confirming their own holiness through the trial, and of blessing their posterity; and to this choice, God urged them with all his authority. Yet it was certain to God notwithstanding, that in these circumstances they would sin and involve their posterity with them in sin, and with this certainty foreseen, he still resolved on this very course of his providence; not for the sake of sin, as the preceding facts show; not for the sake of redemption in the universe *rather than have a universe without sin*; but for introducing redemption in a universe from which sin could not by any providence be excluded. If all the facts attendant on the commencement of sin in our world, do not accord with the supposition we have stated, and throw irreconcilable difficulties around the supposition of a holy universe rejected by God for the sake of redemption, we confess ourselves unable to interpret the plainest facts. God, to say the least, does not in this case act in the manner to be expected of one who was, with his full and hearty choice, *rejecting a holy universe, and preferring before it a universe marred, for healing!* They who affirm that he has *rejected the former*, as though it were possible, and has consequently *preferred the latter to it as a greater good in comparison*, are justly called upon to show, why God, at the time the holiness of the universe was marred, did not come forward, in an open and undissembled manner, and have the honor of marring it himself, which, *on their supposition*, was so honorable to his benevolent heart. Why does he conceal the choice of his heart, behind the shadows and pretexts of law and penalty, and take the pains to throw the charge of marring his kingdom upon his *creatures!** Why has he forever left

* Edwards in his brief notice of this subject, in the *Inquiry on the Freedom of the Will*, has contributed in part to place it on the right foundation. To the inquiry, why God might not as well have created sin in the heart of Adam, as to place him under that condition of influence, in his providence, which rendered

the charge there, fixed on *them* and *them alone*, with his solemn protestations and oaths, uttered for self-clearing, ringing through his kingdom for eternity? and uttered amid lamentations and tears, which throw the wave of his own sincere feeling across every heart in the universe?

Turning from these contemplations, let us now compare a *holy universe* with a *universe embracing sin, punishment, and redemption*, and inquire, whether the latter can be shown to be a higher good on the comparison. If (under the condition of the possibility of both,) one has been rejected for the other, and one has been pronounced by the divine choice inferior to the other, and if this is one thing, as some pretend, which goes to constitute the supreme excellence of the choice of God as to his present works, it would seem that the fact could be discovered by his creatures, and they be in circumstances intelligently to praise God for his goodness in this very thing. We have already adverted to the fact that the discovery seems not to have been made in heaven. We shall now show, perhaps, that there are good reasons.

In order to make the comparison, we must limit it to beings; for sin, holiness, misery, happiness, are not mere abstractions but al-

his sin certain, he replies: "it was *meet*, if sin did come into existence and appear in the world, it should arise from the *imperfection which properly belongs to a creature, as such*, and should appear so to do, that it might appear not to be from God as the efficient and fountain. But this could not have been, if man had been made at first with sin in his heart; nor unless the abiding principle and habit of sin were first introduced by an evil act of the creature. If sin had not arisen from the imperfection of the creature, it would not have been *so visible*, that it did not arise from God as the positive cause and real source of it." Part. iv. § x. Here it will be seen, the fundamental position is, sin ought to have its origin from *imperfection* in creatures; and the fundamental reason, is, that it may not appear to be from God as the efficient. That acute metaphysician should, we think, have advanced one step further; if any weight is to be given to the reason he assigns for his position. For, if it is not meet that God should appear to be the efficient and source of sin, it is not meet that he should be so in *reality*. For, if it is meet and proper to be so, then it is equally meet and proper to appear so to the universe; unless God would dissemble and appear to be what he is not. Let us then advance the position, beyond these limits of *meetness*, into the light of *realities*. Sin *does* have its origin in *reality* from the *imperfection* of creatures; and God, though he superintends the whole creation with his government and providence, is not in *reality* the originating cause, either by commission or omission; either by introducing measures to lead an imperfect universe into sin, or by omitting measures to prevent to the farthest extent possible, the inroads of sin in such a universe. Edwards held, indeed, that God in reality is not the efficient and source of sin by positive infusion; but he still attributed a privative cause to God, representing him as withdrawing into the shades of omission, and there concealing himself, that nothing but the imperfection of the creature might be seen. But we inquire, does sin originate from omission in God?—Omission to do any thing which would secure a further extent of holiness, or prevent a less extent of sin, in a *whole universe*, than he now does? If not, then as in each case he must act with reference to the whole universe, there is no omission on his part;—he cannot do that which would any farther reduce the amount of sin in an imperfect universe.

ways the property of beings. Now for a holy universe, the object on one side of the comparison. How are we to fix on its value? They who affirm it to be a possible good rejected, will allow us the following items, doubtless; the same number of beings as in the present universe, the same duration to their existence, the same mental capacities, the same extent of knowledge; and with these equal qualifications for happiness, full of joy in their perfect devotedness to God and benevolence towards each other. If so, we have, on this side, qualifications for happiness, equal to those on the side of the present universe, with every heart overflowing with holy joy. Why then have we not a greater good in amount? Does not the happiness of the whole, graduated on the same scale, exceed the happiness of a part only, with the misery of the rest? But perhaps, it will be alledged, that we have erred in assuming an item in the estimate, which necessarily affects the result; viz. that the extent of knowledge is equal in both. For trial, let us reduce it to a single case. Gabriel is a moral agent, who would have been just as old, and have had the same mental capacities for knowledge, if his companions had never sinned and this world had never revolted, as now. We go so far, very clearly. Now for his knowledge. He would have for his instruction a book just as full on the natural sciences, on morals, on the history of providence, on the science of theology as now. Up to this time, God would have been as constantly engaged in acts of providence towards the lost brethren of this learner and towards the race of Adam, as now. The benevolence of God, which comprises his whole moral character, instead of being illustrated in acts to recover the guilty, would be illustrated in the holiness, veracity, and justice of his acts of moral government, and the kindness of his providence in preserving and increasing the holy joy of these same beings; and as the persons of the trinity are revealed as active in creation, and present with Adam, they might have been employed in works to inspire love, confidence, obedience in higher measures, and to bring holy beings still nearer to God. The chapters would be as full in size as now. They would vary in incidents. Yet those chapters have never been written; and who can tell that they would not have communicated as much instruction to the mind, and given as much benevolent joy to the heart, of Gabriel, as the chapters which, in consequence of sin, now take their place?

But you tell us the heart-stirring incidents of sin, punishment, redemption are more valuable themes. But why more valuable? Is it because they teach essentially new truths, or old truths in a more affecting manner? The latter surely. For the truths are *not* essentially new. Here is the old truth, sin is a great evil, before taught by conscience and the precept and

penalty of God, now blazing out in heart-rending examples. Here is the old truth, God will punish sin, taught in words before, now shining forth in deeds of holy vengeance, that fill the heart with fear to sin against a God who destroys both body and soul in hell. Here is the old truth, God will do all he can for the welfare of his creatures, taught before in the continued care of his omnipotent providence over the holy, now read in the affecting story of the Son of God, willingly passing through the agonies of Gethsemane and Calvary, on his way to reach the guilty and lost, and pluck them from the jaws of eternal ruin. But what is the value of these more solemn and affecting inculcations of known truth? They are given at great expense, surely: what is their superior value to Gabriel? We, who hold to the defectibility of Gabriel and his need of the guards of God for protection and strength, would say, that now, the smoke of torment continually ascending from the everlasting pit where God inflicts his judgments on the wicked, so fills his heart with fear and reverence; and the Lamb that is in the midst of the throne, with the prints of crucifixion he bore, and the acclamations of the ransomed for their deliverance, so fills his heart with love to the excellence of his Maker; that his holy purpose of serving God is exalted and confirmed beyond all approach of prevailing temptation. The first inculcation of the benevolence of God, his love of holiness, and his hatred of sin, was not sufficiently impressive to shut out all occasions of sin; and when that inculcation began to be disregarded, the opportunity was adopted to make an inculcation, which has forever shut out all future occasions of rebellion in his kingdom. Thus we should say; and make Gabriel a partaker in the benefits of a system of providence, which was the best possible to shut out occasions of sin from the universe and secure an everlasting holiness. The effect on Gabriel is, that increased reverence and affection which bind him in holy choice to the service of God for eternity, beyond the power of any temptation to destroy. We allow that his holy reverence and joy before his Maker is increased, by this new inculcation, beyond what it was possible for God to communicate to his creatures under the first inculcation; yet we maintain that the first inculcation was insufficient in its relation to a moral universe to shut out occasions of sin. If the first inculcation is held to be sufficient for that purpose, as is held by those who affirm that God has rejected a holy universe, then it must be sufficient in one of two ways; either it is sufficient in its own nature as a means, or else God can render it sufficient by directly filling the heart with that degree of fear and love which will lift it above temptation. If now, in this dilemma, it should be affirmed, that the original inculca-

tion is sufficient in its own nature as a means, and that God can rely on the use of it alone, to keep all his creatures holy, we reply, that it was used with Adam and was proved not to be sufficient, in his case of temptation. It is therefore not sufficient in its own nature. If then, it is affirmed, on the other hand, that under this original inculcation God could directly put fear and love into the hearts of his creatures, above what the means themselves are sufficient to effect; we reply, that he could, by the same direct power, put fear and love into the hearts of his creatures to any degree and extent whatever, at least to the highest degree of which their capacities are susceptible. But if he could fill the hearts of his creatures with fear and love, to this extent and degree, under the first inculcation, then he could fill the heart of Gabriel with at least an equal extent and degree of fear and love under it as under the present inculcation: for his *capacities* are equal, surely, to the degree of fear and love which he *actually feels*. Which then, on the comparison, is the greatest good: a *whole universe*, sustained in order and peace and constantly filled with reverence and love and joy before the glories of its Maker, under the mild inculcation of precept and penalty and blessing: or a *part only* of the same beings, filled with *no higher* reverence and love and joy than *before*, under a severer inculcation of the same truths, which costs the *immense sacrifice* involved in the *everlasting loss of happiness and the everlasting misery, experienced by the multitudes who remain?* to say nothing of the pain, occasioned to the holy in witnessing, and to God himself in inflicting, punishment; and to Christ in effecting redemption. Here we have, on the supposition of a *possible holy universe rejected* by God, nothing gained to the *amount* of holiness and happiness in Gabriel, or in any around him who are retained or redeemed to holiness, while multitudes are thrown off into the pit of everlasting sin and misery, by the divine rejection! No wonder, then, that when Gabriel leads at the foot of the eternal throne, in the choral song of praise, and offers up the joy of all hearts in witnessing God's destroying judgments and redeeming mercies, the theme begins with the creatures of God daring to rebel against Infinite majesty and goodness! No wonder that this glorious angel never thought to heighten the song of Moses and the Lamb, and call forth more exulting alleluias at its close, by opening the strain, in celebration of that act,—which some on earth attribute to God as his highest act of love,—God's rejection of a holy universe and choice of a sinning one, for the sake of introducing his judgments and mercies! Ah, this simple-hearted angel before his open-hearted Maker, looks upon judgments and mercies as *means* to keep his creation, and redeem his creation, *from sin*;

never resorted to for any other reason than the one which comes out plainly in the history of providence: viz. the first inculcation of duty and fear and love, made upon his creatures, and the best possible in their original holiness, being insufficient to secure his creation in holiness, and occasions actually arising of failure.

But lest some should think that we have pushed the comparison too soon to its close, and that we have not yet sufficiently looked at the subject on all sides, we will still go forward. We are met in the result to which we are come, with this suggestion, that, even allowing a holy universe to embrace more fear, love, and joy in it, than a universe including sin, punishment and redemption would do; yet, the highest good does not lie in creatures alone, but chiefly in God; and it is said, that God chooses the latter universe, in order to his own highest blessedness in honoring himself by the exhibition of his own glorious perfections in punishment and redemption.

Well then, let us begin here. God, at the head of the universe, must be gratified in the highest possible degree, in order that the highest possible good may be obtained. But how very soon we come back to the comparison we have just left? God creates the universe for himself, that he may have the disposal of it himself, and rejoice over the works of his hands. Doubtless; yet, as a God of love, not of caprice! His benevolent heart takes pleasure in doing good; and he has begun his works of creation and providence, and carries them forward to gratify his own benevolence. He must find the highest possible gratification, so far as his works are concerned, in communicating the highest possible good to his creation. Here we are back again to the created universe, and the comparison goes on just as before.

But, it is said, he can be supremely blessed, only by *honoring himself*, in the highest possible degree, *before his creatures*. True: in order to *do good* to a *moral* creation, he must rule and reign as its *Lord*, requiring, on a throne of moral government, its supreme respect and affection; and in order to *do the highest good possible*, he must do that which will secure honor from his creatures to the highest extent possible. In other words: in a moral universe he cannot supremely gratify his benevolence in any other way than by such an administration of government as will secure, to the farthest extent possible, the honor and obedience of his creatures. No other interpretation can justly be given to the various scriptural expressions which speak of God as being jealous of his glory, vindicating his honor, seeking the glory of his name, showing forth his glory, etc. They refer to the *conduct of a moral creation* in voluntarily honoring him; in ref-

erence to whom, it is his desire, that they honor him with their confidence, reverence, love and obedience, because in this way only can he promote their well-being. Or else, they refer to his *own conduct* in securing honor to himself; in reference to which, it is his purpose to perform every act on his part for the sake of good and to perform his acts, publicly, before his witnessing kingdom, in order that all may see and feel the claims which he justly has, for his worthy deeds, to that very honor from them which he requires, and which is necessary to their well-being. Here, then, we return again, with perfect fairness, to the comparison we have left.

But, it is said, he can have the supreme blessedness of honoring himself in the highest possible degree, only by an *exhibition of his own glorious perfections* in punishment and redemption. We answer that no acts which are unnecessary in themselves to the welfare of his creatures, but which are resorted to for exhibition and show, can redound to his honor; especially, if they are such as incur an otherwise needless expense of great loss and misery in his creatures. For, what distinguishes such conduct from the vain glory which ever forfeits esteem and veneration? Besides: How does God exhibit real goodness, justice and mercy? Only by doing that which is really good, or just, or merciful to the individuals respected, and doing it before his witnessing kingdom. And is justice seen in rejecting the holy in order to punish? Is mercy seen in casting off the holy in order to redeem? Besides: what has God to show, that would require him to *reject a holy universe*? He has nothing else to show, than the love to his kingdom which he shows in it while it is holy, by all his acts of providence and moral government. If he has any *other* trait to show, *essentially different* from *that*, it has not yet come out to the universe, either in punishment or redemption; or, if it had, it could not redound to his honor. His justice is nothing else. His mercy is nothing else. It is love, acting in new and differing circumstances and under new and increasing trials. It is the very love that was originally willing to guard his kingdom by enacting precept and penalty, not shrinking when these milder methods were unheeded and disregarded, from guarding that kingdom still, and securing respect to its despised authority, by inflicting the penalty. It is the very love that seeks to do the highest possible good to his creatures, now giving its only begotten Son for a world in revolt and under condemnation, in order to receive those, who should honor him, to an honorable forgiveness and everlasting life. If therefore it were possible to secure a holy universe, he would have no need, from any desire of exhibiting any thing in his character, to reject that universe for a

sinful one, in order to his own blessedness in honoring himself through exhibition.

But they who hold, that God has voluntarily rejected a holy universe, and introduced sin for the sake of a higher good, resort to mathematical calculation to demonstrate the truth of their theory. We will then resort to that method. And to give every possible advantage for comparison, we will suppose, that, by the manner in which God exhibits his benevolence and holiness in punishment and redemption, the happiness of Gabriel has risen: and, for the sake of definiteness, say it has risen in the proportion of 3 to 1. His gain therefore, is 2. All that part of the universe likewise, that are retained in holiness or redeemed to it, from the same measures of providence, must derive the same proportional gain. The gain of all the finally holy, therefore, is 2. But this is only a part of the universe. Yonder is the smoke of torment rising from the pit! How many beings are there? But before we attempt to pitch upon the proportion of numbers, let us take one being there:—Satan, once the equal, say, of Gabriel. What has he lost? His happiness in a holy universe preserved, would have been 1. That is lost. But it would be lost by annihilation. Yet he exists, bereft of happiness; he exists, in positive misery, and will to eternity, enduring the punishment of God. Here is a new item, *misery*. How shall we reckon that, off against happiness? As a negative quantity? Then as his whole capacity for misery is full, from the same measures which fill the capacity of Gabriel for happiness, we have—3; to which, add his happiness lost 1, we have a total sum to be reckoned off against the happiness of Gabriel, 4. Then we have this result with Gabriel and Satan in the two systems. In a holy universe each has one degree of happiness, and the total is 2. In a universe of holiness rejected for the introduction of sin, punishment and redemption, Gabriel has 3 degrees of happiness and Satan has 4 degrees of evil to be deducted, and the difference shows a preponderance of evil 1. Shall we now pitch upon some probable proportion which exist between the ultimately holy and lost in the present universe, and strike at once, with Bellamy,* the balance general? We will not be so precipitate. We are not prepared yet. Another item stares us, which we have not yet taken into the account: and we must first settle the bearings of that on the great question. We began with the admission, that the happiness of Gabriel had risen in degree: but we did not inquire into the pain which he must have felt at the loss of Satan. We did not fix our eye on that

* Bellamy's Works. p. 67. Vol. II.

item and settle it satisfactorily. Gabriel was a benevolent being who loved Satan, when his equal in piety and benevolence in heaven, as himself; and his benevolent feelings must have been deeply pained and wounded at any needless sacrifice of his companion. When Satan therefore himself wilfully drew off from God and his own estate in glory, this angel, steadfast in his holiness, felt indignant at the deed of Satan and was pained to see his God dishonored and Satan lost. Yet in these circumstances, it was a comfort to his benevolent heart, that God was willing to execute his penalty, and thus maintain the honor of his abused authority and throw protection around his remaining holy kingdom, though Satan is lost, as the reward of his own deeds, and sinks forever a self-destroyer. God is honored, his holy kingdom protected, Satan overcome in his purpose of dishonoring Jehovah; and though he drop a tear over misery, he praises God for his righteous judgments. Go now to Gabriel, and suggest, as the highest matter of praise, that God himself rejected Satan *from the ranks of holiness*, in order to give him and his remaining companions the very joy that they now feel in God's judgments. What a revolution has transpired in his views, if perchance you have gained credence in your story! Where now are the comforts of his benevolent heart? Where his song of praise? Before, he was pained at misery; but was comforted to see God aiming, unmoved, to attain the end with which he began of protecting his honor and his kingdom. But now, the end God seeks, appears in totally a new aspect. The supreme end of God was to please and gratify him with an exhibition; and casting off Satan from the ranks of holiness, was chosen as the means. His benevolent heart recoils, to see God an exhibiter of himself rather than a protector of his kingdom, and to see his companion sacrificed merely for his own personal gratification. Before, when he saw God a protector of his kingdom *from sin*, and Satan sacrificed purely on account of *sin*, he shed a tear over the self-sacrifice of Satan. Now is he filled with horror, to see, in the misery of Satan, only a proof that God is an Exhibiter and Satan sacrificed to the exhibition; and, if no other being but Satan in the wide universe is thus sacrificed to the mere pleasure of exhibition, it is enough. I cannot, cries Gabriel, consent, at the expense of 4 degrees of suffering in Satan, to take 2 degrees of amusement from a needless exhibition. I cannot consent for the pleasure of such an exhibition, to see God stepping aside from the office of a protector of his kingdom from sin, and devoting a holy being to sin and misery both, for the sake of making the exhibition! 'I cannot,' cries another holy angel. 'I cannot,' and 'I cannot,' the word goes round through whole heaven. And so, the balance is struck at once, upon *principle*,

without any reference to the *number* of the lost, in *favor* of a God who is the protector of his kingdom *from* the *inroads* of sin, and against a God who introduces it himself for the *sake of exhibition*. Give us, say they, a God who will do the utmost possible to protect a holy universe from the occurrence of sin, and who, if occasions for its occurrence cannot be wholly shut out from his kingdom by his power, will yet, so order his providence as to reduce it to the limits and bounds where it shall occasion the least evil; and we shall always see him, in fulfilling the *one choice* he entertains respecting *the whole universe*, doing all he can to prevent sin, at each stage of his providence; alike before sin occurs, at the time and afterwards. We shall forever rejoice in him as doing what is wise, what is good, what is holy, what is just, what is merciful, and that his worthy deeds are done in public and in the sight of all the people. In this exhibition of his character we shall rejoice, and assist to publish abroad his worthy deeds in his kingdom, and to magnify his glorious name. But show us a God who, able to advance the holiness of a universe forever and to protect it from all the inroads of sin, does nevertheless, in the *choice* of his heart respecting a *whole universe* actually reject such protection and prefer to gratify his subjects with a mere exhibition at the expense of the sin and misery of one or many of his subjects; and we shall always see him purposely leading off the holy into sin, and preferring their rebellion to obedience in every instance in which it occurs; and in all his conduct towards sinners from first to last, we shall never see any wisdom, any goodness, any holiness, any justice, any mercy but the mere caprice that starts aside from all, simply to make an exhibition which throws eternal horror into all our hearts!—God on the throne stepping aside from the office of ruler and protector to assume the mere pageant, and sacrificing to his caprice multitudes of his creation! The balance is struck, not by mathematical figures, but by moral principles, as fixed and determinate as they, that *more joy and happiness* would be yielded to the creation by God's conducting it forward to universal and everlasting holiness and happiness, *if that were possible*, than would on the other hand, by rejecting that good, *while possible*, and actually preferring to *conduct off many of his creatures into sin*—landing many in everlasting punishment and restoring others—for the sake of *gratifying the holy*, whom he leaves or restores, with the mere *sight and exhibition*! Such a procedure would destroy the happiness of every benevolent, just, and merciful creature.

Such is the disposal we would make of the first theory, which is advanced to account for the sin which exists in the present universe. We affirm, that it is evidently false, and that it goes not, one whit, towards destroying the probabilities we urge to show, that the avoidance of sin in a moral universe is impossible to the Creator.

We come now to the other theory. We will state it in the words of its author.* "God places each and all of his creatures in that series of conditions, in which, on the one hand, the obedience which he requires, would, if rendered, secure the *greatest good*, and in which, if not rendered, the sin which is exerted in its place, may be overruled, so as to secure an *equal good*."

The principal facts on which this theory is founded, are two; that God orders the conditions† of his creatures by his providence, and that he prefers that his creatures, in the conditions in which he places them, should obey rather than sin. The facts we fully admit. And they show, as we contend, that God regulates the condition of creatures, knowing what they will do in these conditions, with the *design* of doing the most *possible* in a whole universe to promote holiness and prevent sin. For, this design to secure the highest good possible on his part, is consistent with the still higher conceivable good of the voluntary cooperation of all his kingdom, and with his preference that they should obey.

But, according to this theory, the design of God in ordering the conditions of his creatures, is not to gain any *certain* results, in the amount of obedience rendered, and the numbers forever holy in his kingdom. He refuses to place his creatures in conditions which would secure the whole universe in holiness to eternity, and places them in others, which bring in all the occasions of sin, merely for the sake of providing *two possibilities*:—the possibility of his creatures securing the greatest good if they obey, and the possibility of his securing an equal good himself, if they refuse! Is this true? Does God do nothing to obtain a decision from his creatures either way? nothing to favor the extent of holiness and prevent that of sin, in his kingdom? Are all his measures of moral government and providence, concentrated on the one object of placing his creatures in conditions of supreme indifference to him, as it respects their obedience or sin? Has God no eye, or heart, fixed on the results which he can secure in the actual decisions of his creatures?

But, the two *alternatives*, which God is supposed to secure, cannot be rendered *equal*. For, in order to provide the alternatives, they must be made to attend on every being in the universe, let him act *either way*. For, if God could not *continue* to provide these alternatives, on the supposition that any being should act differently from what he does, then it is certain, that they are not

* Author of Views in Theology.

† By conditions, we are to understand here precisely that kind and degree of influence which meets each individual at each time he acts.

provided in the case of that being. If then it is the plan of God, to provide an equal possible good to attend on all possible conduct in his creation, let us see what are the possible quantities which he is to render equal. Begin where God opens the drama of the universe, and take, as you follow its supposable progress down to eternity, the two extreme results which are possible. Suppose, that as God begins his providence, his creatures should begin to obey, and as he continues it, they should continue to obey forever. Suppose, on the other hand, that they should begin to sin and continue to sin forever. We have now the extreme results. Are these two possible qualities equal? Can God himself render them equal? What! a whole universe obedient and blest to eternity before his benignant throne, and a whole universe dashed upon the shores of everlasting rebellion and blasphemy and punishment—two equal goods!—both, the greatest possible! But if God cannot render these extreme possible quantities equal, he cannot lay before his creation, in verity, the two possible alternatives of precisely equal good.

But, if the two alternatives could be rendered precisely equal, where is the evidence, that God has exalted the *scale* of these equalities to the *highest possible degree*? He evidently *has not*, on the principles by which this theory is supported by its author. For the reasoning by which this author endeavors to show, that, *holiness is just as good* a material for the glory of God as *sin*,—though applied to that series of conditions in which creatures are actually placed,—proceeds on principles in the moral government of God, which are just as applicable, for aught he has shown to the contrary, to *any* supposable series of conditions, in which they might be placed. And the equality of the alternatives being placed on this ground, that which *exalts* the scale of equal alternatives and renders one system *better* than another, is, in his view, this: that God introduces more *aggravated temptations* into one than another, and thus renders it possible for his subjects, in these circumstances to render a *more valuable obedience* and for him to secure an equally more valuable equivalent. But if God elevates the scale of good in *this way*, then is it plain, that he has not placed the present system on as *high a scale* of good as he might, had he begun on a plan of still *more aggravated temptations*; which would make obedience under it, if rendered, *still more valuable* or the equivalent, if obedience were not rendered, *equally more valuable*. For the writer cannot stop at the precise *graduation* of temptation in the present universe, and hold that God secures the greatest good *possible*; unless he maintains, that, on the present system, God *exhausts his power* in bringing temptations to assail his creatures? This follows, if the highest possible good which

God can secure, is rested on conditions, and not as *we* maintain on the exact results obtained in the proportional *extent* of obedience.

But the two possible and equal alternatives, which this theory supposes to be advancing in a series, it is demonstrable, must *destroy* one another. For they are made to depend on the conditions in which God places his creatures. But God cannot order the condition of his creatures in a social system, (as a moral one must be,) without adopting their *conduct* into the plan of his providence. Unless he regulates his providence in view of certain results, he cannot order with certainty the series of conditions in which his creatures are to be placed. But if subsequent conditions are dependent on previous conduct in the individuals themselves or others, so far at least that they would not otherwise be the precise conditions which they are, the supposed alternatives destroy each other in the series. For illustration, we will take a case. Peter could not be placed in the particular condition of temptation to deny Christ, in which he was placed, independently of the conduct of the priests and elders in seizing and arraigning Christ. A great degree of influence necessarily came upon his mind from their conduct. The theory now reads thus: God placed Peter in this condition at this time, to render it possible for Peter to do the most good by obedience and for himself to do an equal good, if Peter should refuse. Just so it reads respecting the high priests and elders, as to the condition in which they were when they took the resolution to seize and arraign Christ; which preceding conduct of theirs, received into the plan of providence, placed Peter in his condition at this time. Now if it is necessary that Peter should be in the *precise* condition he is, in order to secure the *two* possibilities in *his* case, then it was not possible for the priests and elders, in their previous condition, to take any other resolution than the one they did and yet leave open the two possibilities in the case of Peter; in other words, the two possibilities were not provided for in *their* case. To suppose them provided for in one case, therefore, necessarily destroys their existence in a previous case. Beginning then, down at the remotest stage in the series of providential dispensations in the universe, with the last condition in which any being is placed, and returning, we destroy the two possibilities, in every case in the whole series, up to the beginning of the creation.

But, were the preceding considerations all yielded, where, on this theory is the *ground* for that *choice*, which God entertains, that his creatures, in their various conditions, should *obey rather than sin*? For ourselves, we should suppose that the only alternative, which calls for such a choice, must be that of a *greater* good on the side of *obedience* than *sin*, not a precisely *equal* good on

both sides. If, as we hold, obedience is a direct contribution to the good ends which God is seeking, and sin a wilful detraction from them, and if God, in view of certain results, is taking measures to secure the former and prevent the latter to the utmost extent which it is possible for him to do in the whole universe; the alternative, is still presented, of a greater conceivable good in the voluntary obedience of the whole universe, or, the voluntary co-operation of all his creatures in contributing to the holiness of his kingdom in preventing sin. Yet if it is the supreme concern of God in his administration, as this theory represents, to place his creatures in conditions which shall adjust the good, to be derived to his kingdom from obedience or sin, in scales so nicely balanced as that, let his creatures act either way, neither shall preponderate a feather, and if he really succeeds in establishing those conditions; why should he concern himself more, or care a feather which way his creatures act? Why urge with all his heart that they sin not and die; that they obey and live; that they enter, with all their hearts, into high fellowship with him in promoting his works of benevolence in his kingdom? Is this done to make out the conditions, and keep the balance even? But shall God express a choice which he does not feel? or, in a case of equal goods, shall he feel a choice of this strength, with his whole heart *for* one and his whole heart *against* the other? Will it be said, that it is necessary for him to exert the choice in order to maintain his own *holiness* and *benevolence*? But if it is necessary to holiness and benevolence in God, *really to choose* that every creature obey rather than sin, why was it not equally necessary to his holiness and benevolence *to act upon the choice*, in *forming the plan of his government*, and adopt that plan, if it were *possible*, which would secure, from every creature of his, perfect and everlasting obedience? What sort of holiness or benevolence is that which expresses a preference which it does not feel? and upon which it does not act?

Turning away then from this false and mazy theory, which has for a moment crossed our path, we return to the probabilities we have urged and find them remain ing in all their force.

We have sought a solution for the question: What is that possible system of providence which will keep a moral universe, under unlimited terms as to numbers and duration, forever holy? For, this is the real problem which requires solution, when the question is agitated whether sin in such a universe is avoidable. We have ventured to assert that a demonstration cannot be obtained from the hands of man, either on the side of the affirmative, that there is a system of providence which will have the result, or on the side of the negative, that there is no system

which will have the result. We have put demonstration entirely out of the question. The problem itself involves elements, too unwieldy for the computation of man. He cannot tell what a single change in the present providence of God, will certainly effect in the volitions of a single being. We venture also to go still farther and assert, that there are yet strong probabilities, derived from the present universe and the providence of God over it, that the proper answer to the grand problem, is this: there is no possible scheme of providence which will have that result. The probability is, that the result is out of the question: and that consequently, such a result did not come up to the mind of God, *as a possible thing which he actually rejected*, when he laid out the plan of his present works; and that, in resolving the plan of his works, the real question before his mind and heart was simply this: what works of creation and providence pursued with a moral universe, unavoidably exposed to evil, will have the best possible result in the actual promotion of holiness and diminution of evil. In the answer which we have given to the problem, we have rested the probability on the facts, that a moral universe necessarily embosoms in itself the causes which originate sin, i. e. moral agents under external conditions of choice: that sin has originated from these causes in the present universe, notwithstanding no acts of God have been adopted for the sake of leading his creatures into sin: and that it has originated from these causes in the present universe, notwithstanding all the acts of God have been ordered to secure, in the existing good, the highest possible—which good cannot be shown to be a higher good, than the conceivable good of a whole universe forever retained and advanced in holiness.

But at the very eve of concluding our argument, we are presented, by our opponents, with a scriptural declaration, which it is said, is contradictory to the position, that no scheme of providence can be adopted which will induce universal and everlasting obedience in a moral creation. It is a declaration made by Christ, at the time he represented the difficulty of the conversion of the rich, by the natural impossibility of a camel going through the eye of a needle, and in reply to the inquiry of his disciples, ‘who shall be saved?’—“with men this is impossible but with God all things are possible.”

The occasion gives this testimony a definite application. ‘They who set their heart on riches create, themselves, an obstacle which they will never surmount, without an influence from abroad. Men cannot supply that influence. The omnipotent God, in whose hands are all possible influences, and who has undertaken the work of salvation, can.’

It cannot be pretended that the occasion led Christ to speak

of the natural qualifications of creatures to render obedience, much less, to decide the hypothetical problem of preserving a whole universe holy to eternity. The testimony is not directed to this particular point, surely. On the other hand, his disciples filled with apprehension from the circumstance that, while the few are rich, the many are seeking to be rich, were anxious to learn, not whether a whole universe could be kept holy or all mankind be saved, but whether even *any* can be saved. "Who then shall be saved?" Christ answered simply, that God was able to perform so great a work as the salvation of a rich man.

But, it may be said, the thing which we alledge as probably an impossibility, is *one thing*: and is it not therefore included in "*all things*" and in similar declarations of divine omnipotence in the scriptures? But suppose it is a thing in its very nature, which power cannot reach? To make two and two five; a thing greater than its parts; an existence a non-existence at the same time; are things beyond power. Why may not this one thing be excepted from the all things, on the same *ground*, as being *beyond power*? Do you say the fact of its being beyond power is not self-evident, as in the cases mentioned above. But the exception obviously applies to *impossibilities, as such*, whether they be in things self-evident, or in things demonstrable only by reasoning, or in things beyond demonstration. Two and two making five, is a self-evident impossibility. A machine kept in perpetual motion by the power of gravitation alone, is a demonstrable impossibility; yet, as obvious to a thorough mathematician as a self-evident one.

But, in the existing case, we have a problem beyond the limits of demonstration. But strong probable reasons exist to show, that it is an impossibility. The probability is just as strong, that it is an exception to the *all things*.

If therefore this particular problem was not referred to, in this declaration of Christ; and if the language is not intended to include such things as in their nature are impossibilities, whether they be self-evident, demonstrable only, or beyond the reach of demonstration, the passage is not at all contradictory to our conclusion.*

* Edwards, in vindicating the justice of God in the permission of sin, places the subject on that very ground to which we have now come. At least, his reasoning places it there. "It is unreasonable to suppose," says this writer, "that God should be obliged, if he makes a reasonable creature capable of knowing his will, and receiving a law from him, and being subject to his moral government, at the same time to make it impossible for him to sin, or break his law. For if God be obliged to this, it destroys all use of any commands, laws, promises or threatenings and the very notion of any moral government of God over those reasonable creatures. For to what purpose would it be, for God to give such and such laws, and declare his holy will to a creature, and annex promises and threatenings to move him to his duty, and make him careful to perform it, if the

On the whole then, if you make the inquiry : Does God purpose that sin shall be? We answer : Yes. Does he purpose that it shall be, for good and wise reasons? Yes. Does he purpose it, because it is a necessary means of the greatest good? No. Does he purpose it, because he prefers it to holiness? No. Does he cease therefore to purpose its existence? No. In what sense does he purpose it? As a thing unavoidably incidental to a moral kingdom, he purposed it to be rather than not to be, and to be where it is rather than any where else. *Why* did he purpose it? Because in choosing the *good of a moral kingdom*, he could not avoid it, and in doing the *best possible* to promote the *good of a moral kingdom*, he reduces it to its present limits.

Is there no analogy? The contriver and builder of a metallic clock, finds expansion incidental to the material he is to employ. With this material, he contrives the best possible system of machinery for demonstrating time. This expansibility gives rise to no evil in the whole machine, but in one part : here, it affects, by

creature at the same time has this to think of, that God is obliged to make it impossible for him to break his laws?" "If God be obliged never to permit a creature to fall, there is an end of all divine laws, or government, or authority of God over the creature; there can be no manner of use of these things." Works, Vol. V. p. 504.

Who does not see that the reasoning here proceeds on the ground of an impossibility, that God should create a kingdom of intelligent and moral beings, and undertake to guide and guard them in holiness, by the necessary means of law and moral government; and yet, at the same time, keep *all* in holiness by his power? God is not obliged, is the assertion. And why? The argument is, the thing itself, to which you suppose him obliged, involves an impossibility.

The obligation denied, is that of never permitting a creature to fall. Or to express the position in the positive form: God is not obliged to *keep his whole creation from sin*. For, he is speaking on the case of the actual occurrence of sin; justifying God in relation to its occurrence; not in relation to his creating moral agents merely with the natural ability to sin. And the language he first employs in order to be relevant to the case,—that of "rendering it impossible for a creature to sin"—must mean, to render it impossible, that sin should take place, in whatever way he can be supposed to prevent its taking place. So Edwards expresses the position afterwards. He is not obliged, "never to permit a creature to fall."

The argument is this. God cannot *use* that law and moral government which are the necessary means of sustaining the holiness of his moral kingdom, and at the same time, *not use* them, by destroying their influence. The authority he would use, ceases to be authority; the law he gives, ceases to have the force of law; if, when he ascends the throne and publishes his will and its tremendous sanctions, he gives out, with the same breath, the assurance, that he will himself infallibly keep his whole creation in holiness by his power. On this system of infallible assurance to the whole and at the first, he takes all care and concern out of their hands. "Every one has this to think of," etc. This is the argument.

How then, on the reasoning of Edwards, could God start with success, on the plan of securing the universal and endless holiness of his creation? How, among his fallen creatures in this world even, start with success, on the plan of universal, inevitable salvation?

The language of Edwards on this subject, which justifies God on the ground of no existing obligation, is obscure, and tends to perplex the subject, unless ne-

a direct evil, the result. The wheels depending for their movements on the unchangeable number of their cogs, are not disturbed at all in the accuracy of their operation ; but the pendulum, in its particular place in the system, the artist cannot, if he seeks the best result, but make of a determinate length : and here the occasion arises of certain evil. By the expansibility of so long a rod, the length is so materially affected, under changes of temperature, as to affect the result and detract from the best conceivable good. Yet the artist attains the best possible good. Now ask him : Did you purpose the existence of that expanding rod ? He replies : Yes. For good and wise reasons ? Yes. Did you purpose to have it an expanding rod, rather than a rod not expanding, as a means of the greatest good ? No. Do you prefer its expanding to its non-expanding ? No. In what sense did you purpose the expanding rod ? In contriving a clock, I chose it to be rather than not, and to be where it is rather than any where else. Why did you purpose it ? Because in choosing to make a clock I could not avoid it, and in doing my best for a clock, I made it as short as I could without greater evil. Would it be better if it would not expand ? Yes. Are you then a perfect artist ? What reason have you to doubt it, when I have done the best which the material itself allows ? But the artist here you tell us, is a mere creature, while God is the Creator of all things. What of that ? Our question relates to a specific problem—the best system of contrivance to attain, out of a given kind of material, under given laws of existence, a given kind of result. If the artist has solved this problem, in the construction of his metallic clock, and actually adopted a system the best possible for the result, he has reached the utmost limit which the material itself allows. No

cessary distinctions be made. For if God is under no obligation at all in regard to any of his proceedings, then why use the language : if he is, then on what principles do you except cases ?

We apprehend, that the distinction of an obligation in justice and an obligation in benevolence, will help to clear the subject. The obligation of justice is that of protecting good from injury ; and of benevolence, that of doing the greatest good. The latter of course involves the former as a subordinate. And the latter implies, that he gives to all his creatures the ability of performing the duty which he demands of them in the first place, and also that he uses the highest influence possible on the whole to secure their obedience and happiness. And if in doing this, he cannot effect and secure the obedience of all, the excepted cases are exceptions from the obligation. If to secure the obedience of Satan and the repentance of Judas, would involve a departure from that use of influence which on the whole is best, he is under no obligation in benevolence to secure their obedience in particular. But if you deny the existence of any obligation in benevolence, then you place the justification of God on the basis of justice merely, which can never exist except in subordination to benevolence. You say, that if God should only create a universe who have the adequate powers for obeying the laws he gives them, and should not in fact secure the obedience and happiness of even one creature in it, to all eternity, he is to be justified. But in that case, would not the very creation and sustentation of a universe be acts of needless injury, subservient to nothing good ? And where then appears justice in its high and only office, of guarding good from injury ?

increase of intrinsic power and skill in the artist, would enable him to transcend that limit. He has done the best possible. Gabriel could do no more. God himself, were he to create a metallie clock outright, could do no more.

We will now, in concluding this article, offer a few remarks.

1. On this view of the subject, we may see the harmony of the preceptive will and purpose of God. His law expresses what he would have his creatures do. His purpose, respects all that he will do himself to obtain obedience from his creatures. His law is one of the means which he uses to accomplish his purpose. His purpose is not only to use the law, but so to carry on his works of creation and providence with a universe as to secure the highest possible amount of obedience. What inconsistency is there in expressing the choice of his heart as to what his creatures should do, and his using at the same time the best means in his power to promote the very same object?

2. We may see that God's choosing, *all things considered*, that his creatures should obey, is consistent with his purposing, *all things considered*, to do *just* what he does, to obtain their obedience. For all considerations relating to his glory and the welfare of his creatures, lead him to prefer that his creatures should obey. And all considerations relating to the very same objects, lead him to resolve on doing just what he does to obtain their obedience. And the consistency lies here. Those great ends would be promoted in the highest conceivable degree if all his creatures would obey : and they will be promoted by him in the highest possible degree, by his doing just what he does to obtain their obedience. What he does to obtain their obedience, is a thing totally distinct from their obedience itself : and his purpose about his own conduct is as distinct from his preference as to their conduct ; and his purpose to do just as he does rather than otherwise taking all things into consideration, is just as distinct from his preference that his creatures should obey rather than otherwise, taking all things into consideration—all things, which pertain, respectively, to the two things. In other words, there is no consideration which induces him to purpose to do differently from what he does, and there is no consideration which induces him to prefer that any creature would sin rather than obey. Preferring obedience in others is distinct from securing it ; and if he prefers obedience in others to their sin, he will do all that is possible to secure obedience in his creatures ; and if it is not possible to secure from them *all* that he prefers, he will secure all that is possible. And here is not only a consistency, but one, we venture to affirm, so very intelligible and obvious, that a mere child can understand it and feel its force. Tell him, that his father prefers that all his children should voluntarily perform their duties rather than neglect them ; and that though some will disobey, he still resolves to

do the best he can on his part to induce them to obey ; and there is nothing in the least mystical or inconsistent, to his apprehension. Tell him just so about God ; and he sees at once, that his Heavenly Father is sincere in calling upon him to obey ; that obedience, instead of thwarting any wish of God, would gratify his heart ; that God has purposed to do nothing, in order to hinder him from obedience ; and that, if he refuses, it will be purely his own fault, and God will be very angry with him on that very account.

The difficulties which have been felt on this subject have arisen, we are persuaded, from a positive unwillingness to admit the distinction, between the conduct of God and the conduct of his creatures. If any one will only admit the idea to come clearly before his understanding, (whether he embraces it as true, or not,) that moral beings exist as really as God, and are as immediate causes of their own actions as God is of his, and that all which God does to secure obedience, applies to them as such beings ; he cannot fail to see, that there is full ground for the distinction between the preference of God, as to what they do, and his choice as to what he shall do himself in order to secure their obedience. We say the distinction can be easily enough understood, if any one will have patience enough to look at the subject : and the distinction will also be admitted by every mind, that suffers not the unauthorised idea of immediate divine efficiency to crush it to the dust.

3. We remark that God does all that he wisely can to secure the salvation of men, in perfect consistency with his *electing a part unto salvation*.

In using the means of redemption in this world, God is doing all that he can, in this particular work, to contribute to the good of his *entire* kingdom. For when you sum up *all the good results* which will be gained in the *present universe to eternity*, you describe the *objective motive* of all the works of God—the *very end* chosen by his infinite wisdom and benevolence. He cannot possibly transcend infinite wisdom and benevolence by effecting more, and it would not be infinite wisdom and benevolence to effect less. Consequently he will take all the steps and measures to redeem men that he can, consistently with gain to his entire kingdom. And if the measures taken are such as will secure the salvation of a given number, then are they elected and separated from others, by the very choice and purpose of God to attain the highest good possible. And what is this but affirming that election is founded on good and wise reasons ? Dr. Tyler here asks, ‘ what election is there in such a purpose ? ’ What election ! in performing his works of grace, so as to effect the highest good possible ! What other election can there be, we would ask, worthy of God ?

But, speaking with reference to salvation and perdition, that writer inquires: 'Who made Peter and Judas to differ?' We suppose that question in the mouth of Paul, was applied to a totally different subject from salvation. Τις σε διακρίνει? 'Who distinguisheth thee with gifts?' But were we to apply it to the subject of salvation, the question, as used by Paul, would mean: who saved Peter? Not, who kept Judas in his impenitence? Who saved Peter! God, who interposed and induced him to repent! But did he not interpose for Judas without success? We know not how far he may have gone in that particular instance; but we know that he goes far in favoring salvation in the case of many who perish, and charges on them the very guilt of refusing his grace, and hardening their hearts?

But, says that writer, if God "did as much to effect the salvation of the one as the other; how can it be said that Peter was elected, in distinction from Judas?" Did as much for Judas, as he did for Peter in the whole work of his salvation? Is that the meaning? But we have never said that, or any thing which implies it. Did as much for Judas, as he did for Peter at the time he repented? Is that the meaning? We have not asserted even that. We have said, that what God did for the repentance of Peter was effectual and converting grace, and what he did for Judas was ineffectual and resisted grace; and that what he did for both, was all that he in wisdom could do toward the object of securing their repentance and interest in salvation. In purposing to do this, we say, in intelligible language, that he elected Peter; and that the election was founded not in mere will and volition, but in a wise regard to the highest good he could effect in his kingdom. Every body can see that this is an election. Whether he did as much for both or not, he resolved to do the best he could; and, as a consequence, elected Peter.

But "how was Peter elected in distinction from Judas?" How, in distinction? Why, Peter was elected and Judas was not: what other distinction would you have? Perhaps however Dr. Tyler refers to the will of God. The question would then read thus: Can God *will* to save Peter, in *any sense* in which he does not *will* to save Judas, if he prefers that both should repent rather than perish, and does all that he can for the object? Very well: if that is the meaning, we are glad to come up to the question. For the question carries us to that very point from which we diverge in opinion,—to the very angle where we separate in our subsequent courses of thought: and we like to go back to the guide-board in this case, and point out in intelligible language, so clear that a child can understand it, the path of truth. Well: the guide-board of the scripture is before us: what saith it? how readest thou?—

☞ “NOT WILLING THAT ANY SHOULD PERISH, BUT THAT ALL SHOULD COME TO REPENTANCE.” Again. ☞ “HE HATH MERCY, ON WHOM HE WILL HAVE MERCY, AND WHOM HE WILL, HE HARDENETH.” They are both there, are they not? One is just as true as the other, is it not? How then do we diverge? Let us see.

You say the direction runs thus: He hath mercy on Peter, merely *because* he *will*, and leaves Judas to hardness, merely *because* he *will*: and with this thought you run off, as we insist, into a course of perplexity and error. The distinction made between Peter and Judas, you ground on bare volition, on simple *will* and *wont* in God. Precisely that. Nothing else in the universe. We tell you here, Look at the top of the guide-board: do you follow that direction? When you resolve the failure of salvation in the case of Judas into a pure *will-not* in God as the reason, into sheer unwillingness—a simple resolve to the contrary—are you admitting that God was willing in any sense, that Judas should not perish but should come to repentance? or that he was willing to do any thing in favor of the object? Tell a child, ‘Pure unwillingness in God and nothing else, is the reason why he did not save Judas,’ and we defy you to make him understand how there could be any willingness in God, that Judas should come to repentance and not perish. Your very account of election makes the whole heart of God *for* Peter, and his whole heart *against* Judas, in every step of his conduct; and you leave no room, any where, for God to show the least willingness that Judas should come to repentance.

We will now undertake to tell how we read the guide. God was not willing that Judas should perish, but that he should come to repentance. We understand, that there was a period in the life of Judas before he perished, when the long-suffering of God waited upon him, and he was urged to repentance. And what we understand the declaration to mean is, that God really preferred that Judas should, at that period, repent, rather than neglect repentance and perish. He preferred, with his whole heart, that Judas should do the one rather than the other. You can understand it—a full preference as to what Judas should do in the case. Does it state what Judas would do? Not at all. Does it tell what God himself could consistently do in the case, or how far he could go to favor the object? Not a word of that. Nor can we infer at all from this choice of his heart as to the conduct of Judas in the case, that God could go any farther on his part than he did to favor the repentance of Judas, with any gain to the cause of redemption on the whole, or, at least, with any gain to obedience in his whole kingdom. If he places his creatures in those conditions and under that influence which, while they favor the salvation of all in different degrees, will, on the whole, secure the greatest number possible for him to secure to

holiness and salvation, then it is certain, that the very object on which his heart is set in his own works, will lead him to prefer that all his creatures themselves on their part, should co-operate with him even in the least he does for their repentance, rather than that they should perish.

But, we read on, "He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." He resolves on his own works *himself, without being turned aside or changed, or counseled at all by his creatures.* He will go forward with the measures of his own choice among his creatures, rescuing with his mercy and leaving to hardness whom he will; not turning aside, one moment, for the issue those measures are to have upon individuals. Is not this very plain and intelligible? He will take this course, because he cannot possibly take a better? He resolves as a sovereign, on whom devolves the care and government of the universe, on the best possible course, and, because it is the best possible, he *will* pursue it. This is not acting upon mere will and choice; it is acting upon will and choice that are founded on reason. The child understands the top and bottom of the guide. He sees they both point the same way,—to the heart of God, and that, an undivided heart of unbounded glory!

Once more: 4th. We see the perfect consistency between the purpose of God to do all that is possible for the good of his kingdom, and his ability to answer our prayers. The question has been asked, "If God does all that can to save men, how can we, with any propriety, ask him to do more."* To this we reply: that we never can, with any propriety, ask God to do more in reference to the past than he has done already, nor ask him to change his *purposes* in regard to what he will do in the future. It is no object of prayer, to seek a change in the purposes of God. We place confidence in him, that he purposes to do the best that is possible, and that we can never give him any counsel in our prayers. We always pray, when we perform the act with propriety, in reference to a case on which God has not yet acted. We do not ask him to do more than he has done, for he has, as yet, done nothing in the case. Whatever is to be done in answer to our prayers, is yet to be done. Neither do we ask him to do more than he has purposed to do in the case, either directly or indirectly. Not directly; for that would be impious. Not indirectly; for as we are yet ignorant as to what he has purposed to do, we know not but it is his purpose to do all that we ask and even more. We appeal to his intrinsic power to perform such things as we ask, and rely on those promises by which he has assured us, that it is a rule of conduct with him to answer prayer. And the

consistency between this ability of his to answer our prayers, and his purpose to do all that he wisely can for the salvation of men, lies here : that this very purpose to do all in his power for the object, is a purpose to secure all the acceptable prayer which will ever be offered to him by his children, as well as to give the answer. Since it is a rule of conduct with him to answer all acceptable prayer, the truth is obvious that he could, with propriety, do more for the salvation of men than he does at any time, if more acceptable prayer were offered for the object, than is offered at the time. But since he prefers that men should at all times and in all places lift up holy hands without any wrath or doubting, rather than neglect the duty ; it is likewise obvious that he purposes to do all that he consistently can to excite men to this very duty, and that one of the very obstacles, which lies in the way of advancing his works of saving grace among men, is the fact, that men will offer no more acceptable prayer than they do. This view of the subject is, at least, intelligible. There is no difficulty, surely, in understanding it, whether the view is admitted to be just or not. And it is just as easy to perceive, that, on this view, the two things are perfectly reconcilable and harmonious.

We are disposed, however, not to leave the subject here, clear as it may be to the apprehension even of a child. The very difficulty which our opponents would attempt to thrust upon our views of the divine purposes, we insist, are fastened, irremovably upon theirs. Our views are, that God prefers that men would at all times and in all places offer up acceptable prayer ; and that, in perfect consistency with such a preference, he does all that he can, wisely, to excite them to the performance of the duty. Their views are, that God does *not* prefer that men should universally come to him with acceptable prayer rather than neglect the duty, and that he does *not* do all that he wisely can to excite them to the performance of the duty. These must be their views, if contradictory, as they pretend, to ours. Well then, we are disposed to inquire, *who is allowed* to offer prayer? Who has the necessary warrant? Who can bring out a rescript from the purposes of God to show, that he is not the rejected one whom God on the whole prefers should *not* offer prayer? For without distinct evidence as to this very thing, every one, on coming to God with supplication, must necessarily hesitate and waver, notwithstanding the precepts and promises of God, on the very point whether he is not an individual whom God on the whole prefers should not pray ; and whose prayers, no matter with what spirit offered, will be those with which God will be displeased, for this reason, if no other, that he prefers that they should not be offered. Who will even venture on the act of

prayer, when this stumbling block closes the very avenue to a throne of grace? Much more, who will venture to lift up his hands before God, in confidence and without doubting?

Nor is it any sufficient answer to these practical queries, to reply, that if the individual goes forward and offers the kind of prayer which is acceptable, he will then learn, from his prayer itself, that it is included in the purposes of God, and is therefore the thing which on the whole he prefers. For these queries meet him at the *outset*, *before* he prays; and throw the chill of suspicion and distrust necessarily, over those precepts and promises of God which seem to call him to the throne of grace. Nor do you silence these agitating queries, by referring the individual to previous evidences which he may have given of christian character. For who, on the principle of first finding satisfactory evidence of christian character, can have any encouragement, like Saul of Tarsus, to begin to pray? Besides: whenever an individual, however long, and justly, he may have thought himself a christian, thinks of praying, the query still arises; How can I, since God has purposed that christians shall offer just so many prayers, at so many times, and does on the whole prefer that they should not offer another, at any other time, how can I go forward, at this time, in the confidence that he is ready to hear me? Here again, his anxious queries remain unanswered. Nor can they be answered, on that view of the divine purposes which forecloses the truth, that God on the whole prefers obedience at all times, and in all places, to the contrary.

Our objection is precisely that which is made to that view of atonement, which limits it to certain individuals known only in the secret purpose of God. A limited atonement, we justly affirm, destroys the sincerity of God, in the universal call upon man to exercise faith, and in the universal offer of pardon; and presents God, in those calls and offers, as entertaining those secret reserves which justly awaken suspicion and doubt in every mind, and foreclose the very door of return to God and reconciliation. Now if you tell me, notwithstanding, to go forward and exercise faith, and assert that faith itself, when exercised, will afford the suitable evidence that the atonement was made for me; you do not remove the practical difficulty which meets me, at the very outset. I want a *foundation* for faith in the very *call* and *offer* of God, before I can exercise faith: otherwise, my pretended faith is mere presumption and unwarranted confidence. So here, I need the truth to meet me, at the outset, that God prefers my coming to him with humble supplications, to my remaining at distance from him, perishing in my wants. If he does not on the whole desire this of me, insincerity overclouds and darkens his precepts and promises. They can have no hold on my mind, they cannot lead me forward in confidence to his mercy-seat. That view of the di-

vine purposes which does not leave this truth in the front ground, clear and unclouded ; especially that view which gives God two hearts preferring obedience on the whole here, and preferring sin on the whole there,—nobody can tell where,—sets up an object of adoration, praise and prayer, to whom none can come with the simple confidence of an undivided heart ; none, without the chilly suspicion, that the adoration he would fain bring to one heart of God, will be capriciously rejected by the other ; the praise he offers one, will be wilfully rejected by the other ; the prayer by which he would appeal to one, will be indignantly spurned by the other. All these difficulties meet him at the outset of every duty, and forever stare him out of countenance at every step of his path. A view of the purposes of God which throws irremovable discouragements and obstacles in the way of every practical duty, **MUST BE FALSE.**

Just reverse the scene. Take that view of the divine purposes which we have so often suggested : that God not only prefers on the whole that his creatures should forever perform their duties rather than neglect them, but purposes, on his part, to do all in his power to promote this very object in his kingdom. What is the practical inference of this truth on the mind of that person, to whom God addresses precepts and promises in favor of prayer ? These precepts and promises come to me, he says, from a simple, undivided heart, that is ready to hear every humble and believing prayer,—a heart that sends these very precepts and promises, to promote prayer in the world,—a heart so far from being offended with my attempting to offer supplication, that it will be offended with nothing else, on this very subject, but my neglect or abuse of the privilege. Who does not see here, that the will and purposes of God move in one channel, and impel the wavering, the undecided, the feeble, the animated alike, forward to duty ? The individual is placed in the midst of those influences by which God intends to secure, as far as possible, that performance of duty which he ever prefers. At the outset of all duties, he feels the unabated force of the truth : God's whole heart is in favor of my performing them and against neglect. At the close of them, so far as they have been performed in an acceptable manner, he feels, also, the unabated force of the truth : God's gracious endeavors to bring men to that duty on which his whole heart is set, have here been effectual in me ; and I praise him for his goodness and grace. That view of the divine purposes which thus enforces every practical duty, *must be true.* Ascribe it to whatever name you please—no matter—it is **INTELLIGIBLE AND EVERLASTING TRUTH.**

ART. VII.—STUART ON THE ROMANS.

A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, with a Translation, and Various Excursus. By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Andover: Flagg & Gould. 1832.

It is not long since we met Prof. Stuart before the public, in a "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews." We now meet him again, in a work of the same kind, on the Epistle to the Romans, prepared to welcome whatever new and just criticism or interpretation he may give us, and whatever confirmation he may furnish of truths already well established. We shall most freely and willingly speak the voice of praise, where praise is due. We would rather bestow commendation than censure. On the other hand, he will not take it amiss if we canvass his interpretations with equal freedom, when they appear to be questionable. Our plan is, to give a general view of the work in this article, reserving a more extended examination of particular points for a subsequent number. At present, we shall barely enter and survey the ground.

The book before us though rapidly succeeding the Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, purports not to have been written without 'deep study,' 'thorough research,' 'painful and long-protracted labor.' From expressions of this kind, which occur with great frequency in the preface, and elsewhere, we are at least to infer, that the author supposes these things essential to constitute a good interpreter. In this he is certainly right. To make a commentary of sterling worth, on any part of the bible, but especially on one which leads us over the whole field of christian doctrine, by paths so intricate as those of the Epistle to the Romans, requires indeed profound study. Not only so; it demands a judgment steady in following evidence, not liable to be lead astray by the flickering lights of fancy; an accurate discrimination, to detect the nicest shades of difference between ideas; a power of attention, not falling off from, or glancing over, the point to which effort should be directed; good sense, to distinguish what is useful and proper, from what is unnecessary or worthless; a patience of thought, having "its perfect work;" and a spirit, moreover, already so well imbued with the elevating and "sight-clearing" influences of divine truth, as to catch fire at once from Paul's spirit, and mount up with him to the third heaven, kindling as he kindles, and glowing, as he glows. Such views of the qualifications which are indispensable to the character of a good interpreter, at least of St. Paul's writings, should be always present to the mind of him who enters on that delicate and responsible office; and of such we may add, "if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye *do* them."

In whatever light we view the work before us, it is one of deep interest, and will be so regarded by the religious community. The

station and learning of the author; his past eminent services to the cause of sacred literature in our country; the consideration that such a Commentary cannot but have important theological bearings; the perfect independence with which we are entitled to expect opinions to have been formed, which must have such bearings; invest the work with a strong claim to our attention, and awaken a natural curiosity, to learn what are the views of the author on some important and disputed passages in the Epistle, which he has selected as the field of his labors. But before we obey this impulse, we will avail ourselves of the opportunity to make some remarks of a more general nature.

Modern times have contributed greatly to the advancement of sacred interpretation. Indeed, as a distinct science, having a form and features of its own, interpretation in general, dates its origin within a recent period. Not but that most, or all of its principles have been always and every where practically understood, where language has been spoken, or signs used to express ideas. There could be no interchange of thought or of feeling, without a practical application of those principles. But they have been *tacitly* understood and acted upon, not drawn out and expressed in words. *Now*, we have the true principles of the science, as settled and determined by the known laws of language, explicitly developed; and the rules of the art, deducible from those principles, stated in form. We have moreover, treasures of materials, accumulated to aid the interpreter of scripture in the actual execution of his task. For most of these labors, especially so far as the *collection of materials* for the interpreter's use, is concerned, we are indebted to the assiduous scholars of Germany. In the *use* of these materials, indeed, they sometimes fail. There is often the same difference between the German scholar considered as a lexicographer, or a writer on the science of interpretation, and the same person considered as an actual interpreter of scripture, which exists between the man of theory and the man of practice. Or, if he succeeds in the simple business of grammatical interpretation, he seldom goes farther. He does not follow out the interpretations into the length and breadth of their theological consequences. He stops at the very point where the investigation of scriptural truth becomes most interesting. He toils through a long and dreary wilderness of verbal and grammatical criticism, and, just as he is emerging into open ground, where clear light, and beatific visions of truth, await him, turns back, as though his work was done, when not even the tithe of it is accomplished. Thus it happens, that while the interpretation of the scriptures, the business of determining their grammatical meaning, is in a great degree, settled in Germany; theology, the highest and best kind of divine knowledge, is left extremely unsettled and defective.

It is a remarkable fact, that the scriptures alone should have been so long denied the right of being interpreted by the same principles which are unhesitatingly applied to the language of common life, and to other books in which the same kind of usage prevails. At no period of its existence has the christian church enjoyed an immunity from the influence of false systems of philosophy upon sacred interpretation. Even the reformation did not escape. The divines of that period had not shaken themselves loose from the authority of names and systems. Though they aimed to make the bible the religion of protestants, it was the bible as modified by the philosophy of Augustine and Aristotle. We need not dwell on the instances of being "wise above what is written," which abound in the theoretical expositions, we do not say the fundamental doctrines, of the reformers. The great outlines of divine truth, they saw clearly. These are drawn so plain in the bible, that even a perverse philosophy could not obscure them from their view. But when they came to explain these doctrines, we perceive at once that they were educated in the school of Aristotle. It was the great fault, as is well known, of that school to reason *a priori*, concerning the nature of things in the material and the moral world, instead of proceeding from facts back to general principles. The method was, first to form the system, and then to find or explain facts to agree with it. In a similar manner, the divines of the reformation, following the habits of reasoning in which they had been trained, first made out their philosophy, and that too, a closet-philosophy, not one found among the realities of the moral world, as they are exhibited to common sense and consciousness; and then interpreted the scriptures to accord with the views thus erroneously formed. That the *philosophy* of theology at the period to which we refer, originated in the manner now described, is susceptible of overwhelming proof.

From the prevalence of a different philosophy, and a different mode of interpretation, many *theoretical* views which the reformers generally held, have, for a considerable time, been going into disuse, and are ready to vanish away. It was not strange that those great and good men should clearly discern the distinguishing doctrines, or *facts*, of the gospel, and at the same time, not discover the true reason of those facts, but in this respect, be misled by previous opinions and habits of thinking. But it is no longer reputable to the understanding of any man, to maintain for example, as Calvin did, that one moral being can, by any possibility, be, or be justly considered as being, guilty of the sin of another. It is too late in the day, the light of truth has risen too far above the horizon, for so dark an absurdity to be imposed, as sound sense and correct philosophy, upon men at all informed on moral subjects. Ancient systems of philosophy, the Platonic, the Gnostic, and the Aristotelian together, have been given to the wide winds;

worthy, in the main, of no better fate. The world will not go back to that darkness again. No power can avail to bring the human mind anew under that bondage of mental and moral death. Once disenthralled, it is free forever.

But while erroneous systems are thus yielding to the progress of truth, we by no means anticipate an entire abandonment of *all* philosophy, in matters of religion. Such an abandonment, we do not hesitate to say, is impossible. Neither the interpreter of scripture, nor the theologian, can proceed a step, without presupposing some *fundamental principles respecting the nature of things*. For proof of this, we need only refer to the numberless instances in which the literal meaning of a passage is set aside by common consent, simply because that meaning is inconsistent with something which every one knows and admits to be true; and to the undisputed and indisputable fact, that the bible meets and recognizes men as *already* possessing a mass of correct knowledge, respecting the first principles of things in the moral world. The latter fact shows that the theologian *must*, the former that he *does*, make use of something which may properly be called philosophy.

We are not, indeed, by any means tenacious of the term in question. We never cling to names, except as the vehicle of ideas. For ourselves we prefer to call those first principles of things, the *dictates of common sense*; for the latter phraseology justly and accurately describes their character and parentage. Still, we insist that there is no impropriety in calling them the decisions of philosophy. It will be admitted that there may be, and is, a *natural* philosophy which is correct; and that it is not the less so, because it has taken the place of systems, which consisted throughout of egregious error. The Copernican system is true, and not the less true because that of Ptolemy was false; and yet the former system is *philosophy*, a philosophy of the celestial phenomena. It can be called by no other name so appropriate, and so well sanctioned by general usage. But *why* is it called philosophy? What do we learn of its character and subject-matter, by that appellation? Or rather, what are the realities themselves, about which it is conversant? Surely, those general facts, or laws of the material universe, which explain the more obvious and sensible phenomena. Or, we may say, that natural philosophy, in general, is conversant with the *reasons* of things,—the more obvious class of things,—in the natural world. Now will any man show us that there is not, and cannot be, a philosophy conversant with the *reasons* of things in the moral world, or, if you please, with its general laws, or facts, which shall also be as correct, and as easily proved so, as the Copernican system of astronomical philosophy? Certainly there *are* first principles, or reasons of things in the moral world, as there are in the natural; if so, there may as well be a science, and a true science, of the former, as of the latter. And

since both are alike conversant with the reasons of things, or ultimate facts, both may with equal propriety, be called philosophy. Were we to give a name, however, to the science of first principles in the moral world, which should convey the most meaning in the shortest compass, we should call it the *philosophy of common sense*.

But call these first principles by what name we may, or call them by no name at all, the things themselves remain, and will remain, forever the same. No power of man can avail to change their nature, or annihilate them; and least of all can that be done by any alterations in nomenclature. Men may do their best to bring into discredit the knowledge of these things; they may pour odium on the word philosophy; they may banish it from the English language; they may visit with anathemas those who venture to designate by it the eternal truths of which we speak: but these truths will still be rooted fast in the convictions of mankind. Marshal argument after argument, against the word in question; scatter the seeds of suspicion, the fire-brands of contention, throughout a whole community, because some persons say there is a true *philosophy of things*; this will not move the *things*, the elementary ideas of moral truth, one hair's breadth from their safe abiding-place in the human breast.

In maintaining that there is a true philosophy which is to be applied in the interpretation of the bible, we are not without the support of all interpreters and theologians of note. The former, when they appeal to the nature of things, acknowledge our doctrine. They not only acknowledge it practically, by actually applying their knowledge of fundamental truths, to ascertain the meaning of the word of God; but they explicitly own it as one of the principles of interpretation, that the literal meaning of a word is to be rejected, for some other, when the former would make a passage assert known falsehood, and the latter would not. In the phrase, "nature of things," moreover, they mean to include things in the moral as well as in the natural world. For on what other principle does Prof. Stuart maintain, that anger, or wrath, as predicated of God, does not mean sinful passion, which is seen in men, except this, that the moral nature of the two things, viz. perfect holiness, and sinful passion, is such that they cannot, by any possibility co-exist in the same being; or that a being cannot be perfectly benevolent, and at the same time, retaliate an injury on another, merely for personal gratification? On what ground does he most strenuously maintain that God did not exert a physical agency in hardening Pharaoh's heart, than, that such is the nature of perfect benevolence, and such the nature and tendencies of sin, that God, an infinitely benevolent being, cannot be directly and efficiently engaged in producing the latter? Why does he hold that all sin must be voluntary, except from the nature of the case? In like manner, those theologians admit our doctrine, who, on the

ground that the moral character of one being cannot be transferred to another, deny the literal imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and of Christ's righteousness to believers; as well as those who hold that Christ did not suffer as much as all mankind, or as the elect, would have done, or that regeneration is not a literal creation of new faculties. We would by no means intimate that the known nature of things *alone*, leads the theologians and interpreters in question to the above specified conclusions; but that this is a principal source of evidence in these cases, cannot be denied. There may, in each and every instance, be other reasons of an exegetical nature, which co-operate with the former, and which *seem*, to many minds, to constitute the *only* evidence in the case. But an accurate discrimination often detects, under what wears the appearance of mere exigency, an application of the primary dictates of common sense.

Should any one alledge that to adopt the principle in question, is after all, making a bible for ourselves, we would ask him to try the experiment of divesting his mind of all the ideas he possesses, which can have the least influence on his views of the meaning of scripture. Let him cast into perfect oblivion all his conceptions of God, of right, wrong, happiness, misery, obligation, accountability, authority, moral government, law, punishment, reward, holiness, sin, justice, mercy, repentance, pardon, etc. Let him bring his mind, if he can, into a state of utter destitution of ideas on these subjects, that he may be prepared "to come to the law and to the testimony," as he would think, without pre-judgment. His endeavors to dispossess himself of these elementary ideas will be as much in vain, as the attempt would be, to return to original nothing. But suppose for once, he should be able utterly to forget, for instance, what *faith* is, so as to affix to that word no more meaning than the mere English reader would to the letters *R a r a*, would the bible be a *revelation* to *him*, respecting the nature of faith? Would the word *faith*, or any other expressing the same or a kindred idea, be any thing more to him, if written, than marks upon paper, or if uttered in his ear, than mere sound? To come to the pages of the written word, then, and with the docility of a learner, to ask simply what it teaches, and no more, does not imply that we are not to carry with us that primary knowledge of things which constitutes one of the essential elements of a moral being. We might as well cease to be moral beings, and yet continue to exist, as to divest ourselves of every notion that has respect to the fundamental truths, or subjects, in moral science. Not till man has uncreated himself, will he be able to obliterate from his mind all impressions of those truths. We are happy to find Prof. Stuart coinciding with us on this point. So strong are his impressions respecting the nature and essential requisites of accountable agency, that he affirms it to be necessary for him to be made

over again, and to have new faculties, before he can believe it to be consistent with perfect justice to punish men for sin which is their's only by *imputation*, or *putatively*.

We do indeed occasionally find Prof. Stuart endeavoring to avoid the appearance of what he calls *theologizing*. If by *theologizing*, he means *extorting* from the bible, *nolens volens*, what will support one's peculiar theological views, he is unquestionably right in avoiding all appearance of it. But if, secondly, by the term in question, he means an application of the first principles of moral and religious truth to the interpretation of the scriptures, this he cannot possibly avoid, and still interpret correctly. And if thirdly, he means by *theologizing*, tracing out the bearings of his interpretations on particular theological points, he was under an unavoidable necessity either of doing this to some extent, or of making an extremely meager commentary. The Epistle to the Romans, above all other parts of the bible, is theological ground; and the results of the interpreter must, in the main, be of a theological nature. Of almost every verse in the doctrinal part of the epistle, it is the same to ask what it means, as it is to ask what the bible teaches on a vital point of theology. The interpreter of course, is not bound to carry out his results in the field of theological investigation, to their utmost extent; but he must show precisely what they are, and whither they tend. This he cannot do, without taking his position as a theologian. He must either do nothing, or commit himself on points which are theological. If any thing in the compass of human conception is theological, surely the doctrines of Paul are of this kind, when he undertakes to prove that a man cannot be justified by the deeds of the law, and that the law is not made void by pardon through Christ. So when he asserts that sin is a transgression of the law, he teaches a theological doctrine; and no interpreter can go beyond a literal translation of it, i. e. enter into an explanation of the thing meant by that declaration, without having to do with the very core of theology. Of what use, indeed, is it, to attempt to interpret a great part of the scriptures at all, if the results which we obtain are not to be considered as theological truth? Until the bible has ceased to be the fountain head of theology, it will remain true, that the interpreter of Paul's epistles, at least, must *theologize*. It will be out of his power to remain neutral. He may stand alone, or come under other colors; but a flag he must have, if he is an intelligible writer.

That change in the method of interpreting the scriptures which commenced with the reformation, as we have intimated, was retarded by the long lingering attachment of learned men to old scholastic modes of philosophizing. From the first, indeed, interpreters studied critically the original language, and investigated the history, antiquities, manners and customs, etc. of the Jews; but they were too prone to expect that the meaning when discovered, would be in accordance

with the dogmas of a vain and unintelligible philosophy. Their mode of interpreting was not based on the principle, that the language of the bible is that of common life; and of course they did not interpret it rigidly according to the laws which obtain in that kind of usage. Nor had so much light as we now possess, been thrown at that time on the oriental languages: investigations of the *usus loquendi*, and others of a kindred nature, whose object is to discover the grammatical meaning of the scriptures, were not then as now, all in all with the interpreter. The *usus loquendi* of the original language of scripture, was not carefully attended to; the modern usage of philosophical or theological sects was invested with too much authority; and it was not duly understood that the language of the bible is not that of logical analysis and abstraction, but of common life in the countries where, among the people for whom, and on the subjects about which, it was written. Greater facility was afforded by this state of sacred science than is now given, for accommodating the declarations of the bible to preconceived and false opinions. We cannot stop here to show, how, gradually at first, but rapidly during the last half century, the interpretation of the scriptures, with its kindred and dependent studies, advanced to its present state of comparative perfection. Suffice it to say, that the critical study of the bible, is the "specific praise of our times." In no department of knowledge, of equal extent, and certainly in none of greater importance, are the fruits of learned labor more abundant than in this. Nothing is wanting to fulfil the highest hopes of the lover of divine truth, but that a generation should arise, to carry out these results into the wide field of theology. A glory beyond the brightness of past or present days, will shine around the age that shall do this. But the men of our own times are lingering about the threshold of these higher and nobler realities. They love to live in the houses built by their fathers, and shrink from the toil and risk of independent effort.

But it is time we should come more immediately to the work before us. There can be no question that it is a most valuable accession to the sacred literature of our country. It contains a treasure of criticism and sound learning, on that most interesting and difficult portion of the scriptures which it proposes to illustrate. We do not hesitate to say that it will do honor to the author, both as a scholar and a christian. It cannot but tend to promote among us, especially in the ranks of the ministry, the critical study and knowledge of the scriptures, so necessary in order to "prove all things," and "hold fast that which is good." A more correct and higher tone will thus be imparted to practical religion, and greater certainty to theological science in our country. Anticipating their happy influence in aid of the cause of truth and piety from this and former productions of Prof. Stuart, we welcome the present opportunity of expressing our high sense of the obligation under which

the religious community is laid, both for what he has himself done, and for what he has inspired others to do, for the promotion of sacred literature in our country. Our hope is, and it is our confident expectation, that the impulse thus given to this course, will not be lost; that the light which the learning and industry of other countries have thrown upon the method and means of interpreting the scriptures, will still be reflected to our shores, and new light elicited, to shine on the pages of the written word. Happy will it be for us, if, distinguishing "the precious from the vile," the authors of our sacred literature shall continue to furnish us with that, and only that, of their own and of foreign production, which will promote the cause of truth and righteousness. We are persuaded, indeed, that the good sense and soberness of our countrymen, with the blessing of God on the pious labors of christians, will prove an effectual safeguard against the barren refinements and unbelieving speculations of German theology.

The introduction to the commentary under review, especially that part which relates to the origin, character, and state of the church at Rome, is ably drawn up, and throws much light on the epistle. The following paragraphs exhibit the sum of the historical testimonies respecting the origin of that church.

Nothing can be clearer, than that a considerable portion of the church at Rome consisted of Jewish converts; see ii. 17—iii. 19. iv. 1, 12. vii. 1—4, and chaps. ix.—xi. Nor is there any serious difficulty of a historical nature, in making out the probability of this. When Pompey overran Judea with a conquering army, about 63 years before the christian era, he caused many captive Jews to be sent to Rome. There they were sold into slavery, as was usual in respect to captives taken in war. But their persevering and unconquerable determination to observe the sabbath, and to practice many of the Levitical rites and customs, gave their Roman masters so much trouble, that they chose to liberate them rather than to keep them. As there was a large body of persons so liberated, the government assigned them a place opposite to Rome, across the Tiber, where they built a town which was principally inhabited by Jews. Here Philo found them just before Paul's time; Legat. ad Caium. p. 1014 ed. Frankf. The reader who wishes for historical vouchers in respect to the number of Jews at Rome, during the apostolic age, may consult Joseph. Antiq. XVII. 14. XVIII. 5, ed. Cologn. Dio Cassius, XXXVI. p. 37. Suetonii vita Tiberii, cap. 36.

When the first impressions arising from the degradation of captivity and slavery began to wear away, the Roman citizens seem to have looked at the Jewish community with some degree of respect, or at least with not a little of curiosity. Whether it arose from the disgust which delicate females among the Romans felt for the obscene rites of heathenism which they were called to practice or witness, or whether it sprung from a curiosity which is characteristic of the female sex, the fact was, that in Ovid's time (ob. A. D. 17.) some of the most elegant and polished females thronged the Jewish assemblies.

By degrees men also, as was natural, began to frequent the assemblies of those once despised foreigners.

Seneca also, (fl. A. D. 64.) about the time when Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans, says, in a fragment preserved by Augustine (De Civ. Dei, vii. 11.) that "so many Romans had received the Jewish [he means by this the christian] religion, that *per omnes jam terras recepta sit, victi victoribus leges delectantur.*" Tacitus, in his Annals, likewise represents the "exitiabilis superstitio" (christian religion) as breaking out again after being repressed, and spreading *non modo per Judeam, sed per urbem [Romam] etiam.* pp. 39, 40.

The epistle also exhibits internal evidence, that the church at Rome was composed of both Gentiles and Jews.

Prof. Stuart thus represents the state of opinion and feeling in that church, when the epistle was written.

That this church consisted of Jews and Gentiles, we have already seen; § 2 above. That many of the erroneous views which Paul combats in it, were such as the Hebrews were prone to cherish, there can be no doubt, on the part of any one well acquainted with the history of Jewish opinions. That grounds of dissension among its members existed in the church at Rome, we can hardly refuse to believe, when we consider the general tenor of the epistle. The national pride of the Jew; his attachment to the Mosaic institutes, and especially to the Levitical rites and distinctions of clean and unclean; his impatience of subordination in any respect to Gentiles; his unwillingness to believe that they could be admitted to equal privileges with the Jew, in the kingdom of the Messiah, and particularly without becoming proselytes to the Mosaic religion; his proneness to feel indignant at the government of heathen magistrates over him; all this lies on the face of the epistle, and cannot well be overlooked by any considerate and attentive reader.

On the other hand; the Gentiles disregarded the prejudices of the Jews, especially about circumcision, and meats and drinks and holidays; they were wounded at the claim of superiority which the Jews seemed to make; and knowing that the great apostle to the Gentiles was an advocate for their equal rights and privileges, they no doubt engaged in contest with the Jews with an unyielding spirit. Such a state of things very naturally gave rise to the discussions in the epistle to the Romans, and to all the cautions and precepts contained in the hortatory part of the epistle. pp. 50, 51.

We have before intimated that a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans cannot be thoroughly critical, without having important theological bearings. Prof. Stuart at least has not disguised his sentiments, on some of the leading topics which are brought into view in the epistle. It will undoubtedly, therefore, be interesting to our readers, to see into which scale he throws the weight of his authority, on disputed points. Should any coincidences be found between his opinions and our own, the public will undoubtedly do him the justice to consider them as the result, on his part, of following his own independent views of the evidence in each successive case.

1. *The free moral agency of man.* On this subject, Prof. Stuart is directly at variance with the advocates of divine efficiency. While the latter still hold the *form* of sound words, in respect to free agency, they deny that any created being can, like God, originate thought and volition. These, they maintain, are created *free* by irresistible power, within us. *How* this can be, they do not pretend to tell us, nor do they pretend that it can be fathomed by the human mind; but they affirm, nevertheless, that they know it is so, let the absurdity of the doctrine be what it may. On this point Prof. Stuart says.

As to free agency itself; cannot God make a creature *in his own image*, free like himself, rational like himself, the originator of thoughts and volitions like himself? Can this be disproved? The fact that we are *dependent* beings, will not prove that we may not be *free agents* as to the exercise of the powers with which we are endowed,—free in a sense like to that in which God himself, as a rational being, is free. Nor will this establish any *contingency* or *uncertainty* of

events in the universe. Could not God as well foresee what would be the free and voluntary thoughts of men, in consequence of the powers which he should give them, as he could foresee thoughts and volitions which would proceed from the operation of external causes upon them? p 564.

We need not say how entirely these views, especially those presented in the two last sentences, coincide with the principles on which we have explained and defended the doctrine of decrees. God foreknows the actions of a free agent by direct *intuition*, and not merely by reasoning from cause to effect.

Again, after remarking that the movements of a machine are necessary by an irresistible necessity, or in other words, in consequence of the action of a power which the parts of a machine subjected to that action, are in no sense whatever able to resist, he adds :

Not so in the world of immaterial and *spiritual* being. Man is made *in the image of God* ; therefore he has a free-agency like to that of his Maker. From its very nature, this free-agency is incapable of *mechanical* control. Motives, arguments, inducements may move, convince, persuade ; but they cannot control by a necessity like that in the world of matter. That they cannot, is owing to the very nature itself of a free agent ; who is no longer free, if he have no *ultimate* choice and power of his own. The bible every where ascribes such power to man.

All arguments, then, drawn from cause or causation and effect in the *material* world, applied to the subject of *spiritual agency and influence*, are wrongly applied and cannot serve to cast any thing but darkness on this deeply interesting subject.

All the deductions in respect to *fatalism*, moreover, which are made out and charged upon those who hold the doctrine of God's foreknowledge and eternal purposes, are made out by a process of reasoning which has its basis in material analogies. A regular, necessitous, mechanical concatenation of cause and effect, altogether like that in the world of nature, is predicated of the doctrine of the divine purposes or decrees ; and then the charge of fatalism and absurdity of course follows. Let those who would avoid this, take good care, then, not to reason about *spirit* in the same way as they do about matter. pp. 565, 566,

Still, Prof. Stuart does not deny, but most fully admits that there is an important "sense in which *all* things and events," (sin, of course, not excepted,) "may be ascribed to God." He explains himself to mean that the divine agency in the production of sin consists in this, that "God creates men ; endows them with powers and faculties which enable them to sin ; and places them in a world surrounded by temptation, and all this, *knowing* that they certainly will sin." He adds, moreover, that the case of Pharaoh whose heart God is said to have hardened, "differs not, in principle from what happens every day ;" by which he must mean that God exerts the same kind, if not the same degree of agency, in regard to all other sin, as he did in hardening Pharaoh's heart.

Moreover, Prof. Stuart holds that man is born "with faculties to do good, yea, all the faculties that are needed." Of course, no new faculties or powers are required in order that the sinner may love and obey God, even perfectly. To possess "all the faculties that are needed to do good," would surely supersede the necessity of any new-created *taste, relish, property*, or whatever else may be imagined needful, as a basis or a preparative for the exercise of holy

affections. Now these are exactly the views for which we have contended.

More specifically, Prof. Stuart maintains, as may be seen in his commentary on Romans vii. 13—25, that the unregenerate sinner not only understands, but strongly approves, the moral law. Of course, by approbation in this connection, he does not mean choice or purpose to obey, but an intellectual conviction that the tendency of that kind of action which the law requires, is to produce perfect happiness, and a consequent approbation, also intellectual, of the law as having that tendency. Witness the following declaration.

"That the law does sustain such a character," i. e. that it is good, "must be well known to the sinner himself. His own reason and conscience take sides with the law, and approve its precepts. Yet still, so *carnally inclined* is he, that he listens not to these, but acts directly against them.—p. 300.

"In the former," i. e. the *inner man*, or reason and conscience, "is still a portion of the image of God, which discerns, and cannot but approve, the holy and perfect law of God that is merely a transcript of his own nature. That the unregenerate have reason and conscience which approve, and must approve, the divine law shows nothing more than that they are *rational* and *moral* beings, with faculties adapted to a state of moral probation; and that they are made in the image of God, so far as rational and moral nature is concerned. This is merely saying that they are *men*, and not brutes. The faculty to discern what is good, the power to approve of it, is in itself no more holy or sinful, than the faculty of ratiocination is, or of seeing or hearing. Nothing can be more unfounded, than the supposition that moral good is put to the account of the sinner, merely, because one assigns to him reason to discover its nature, and conscience to approve it. Without these he could not be a rational and moral being. They are mere *pura naturalia*, to speak in the language of the old theology.—300, 301.

Still farther, Prof. Stuart speaks of the heathen as having a moral sense, by which they may acquire a knowledge of right and wrong. He says,

Those commit a great mistake, then, who deny that men can have any sense of moral duty or obligation, without a knowledge of the scriptures. The apostle's argument, in order to convince the Gentiles of sin, rests on a basis entirely different from this. And if it be alledged, that in this way the necessity of a revelation is superseded; I answer, not at all. The knowledge of some points of moral duty, or the power to acquire such knowledge, is one thing; a disposition to obey the precepts of natural religion, is another. The latter can be affirmed of few indeed, among the heathen of any age or nation. Again; faculties adapted to discover the path of duty, are one thing; the use of them so as effectually to do this, is another. The former the apostle asserts; the latter he denies.—p. 129.

In these statements of Prof. Stuart, no one can fail to recognize the doctrine, that the mind of the sinner is *constitutionally* susceptible of being affected by the truth. We deem these quotations sufficient to show the coincidence between Prof. Stuart's views and our own, on the topic under consideration.

II. *The Nature of Sin.* On this point Prof. Stuart is full and explicit. He recognizes no other sin as possible or conceivable, except the *voluntary transgression of known law*. The following is his language on this subject. "Sin is *ἀνομία*, i. e. want of con-

formity to law; of course a *voluntary non-conformity* must be meant, the *voluntary non-conformity of an intelligent, rational, moral, free agent*, for no other is capable of sin unless we would maintain that inanimate substances, and brutes, and ideots, and madmen, are sinners." This is said, moreover, in the midst of an argument from scripture to show, that original sin does not consist in "a disposition or inclination that is connate, is antecedent to all choice and volition, and is in itself not only sinful, but the basis and ground of all subsequent sin." This fact sets the theology of Prof. Stuart, on the point in question, beyond a doubt. He holds that there is no sin BACK OF THE WILL; none that is not *actual*; no "connate," "innate," or "propagated" depravity; nothing, in short, but what the mind takes cognizance of as "its own act." To hold a moral being accountable for any thing besides that which is his own act, he considers inconsistent with the plainest principles of justice.

On the subject of *infant character*, Prof. Stuart ventures much farther than we have ever done. We have chosen to say merely that whenever moral agency commences, *then* we are to date the commencement of sin. We have not undertaken to decide at what period this takes place, or denied that it may be at the commencement of our being. Prof. Stuart, however, does decide on the subject.

The account of infants in Is. vii. 15, 16; in Jonah iv. 11; and in Deut. i. 39; compared with Rom. iv. 15. 1 John iii. 4. James iv. 17. Luke xii. 47, 48. John ix. 41. xv. 22—24. Rom. i. 20, 21, 32, casts strong light on the explicit declaration of Paul in Rom. ix. 11. For the substance of these declarations of the scriptures, is, that "to him who knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, it is sin;" that where there is no such knowledge, i. e. "where there is no law, there is no transgression;" for "sin is ἀνομία," want of conformity to law; of course a *voluntary non-conformity* must be meant, the *voluntary non-conformity of an intelligent, rational, moral, free agent*; for no other is capable of sin, unless we would maintain that inanimate substances, and brutes, and ideots, and madmen are sinners. Thus one class of texts above cited, teaches. Another class as clearly shows, that our sins bear an exact proportion, in respect to their heinousness, to the degree of light which we have, and the motives to holy obedience by which we are urged; all which of course implies, that if we were in a state in which we had no light, and were incapable of perceiving or feeling the force of any motives, then we should not be sinners. Another class, moreover, develops to us very clearly that infants are incapable of the knowledge in question. Even of the child *Immanuel* is this explicitly asserted; and the assertion is made, moreover, concerning him *after* his birth, Is. vii. 15, 16. The very same thing is explicitly affirmed also by Moses, concerning all the very young children of the Israelites: "Your children, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil," Deut. i. 39. To the same purpose is the text in Jonah iv. 11. It is the like view of little children, which the Savior presents, when he says to his disciples: "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," Mat. xviii. 3. Again: "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," Mat. xix. 14. Mark x. 13. Luke xviii. 15, 16. So likewise the apostle Paul: "Howbeit, in malice be ye children," 1 Cor. xiv. 20. These comparisons do not imply that little children are positively holy. I know of no declaration in the bible of such import. But they do seem to imply, that they are *innocent*, (*innocuous*), i. e. that they are not the subjects of positively sinful passions and affections, such as malice, ambition, etc.; for on any other ground, how could they be made the objects of such a

affections. Now these are exactly the views for which we have contended.

More specifically, Prof. Stuart maintains, as may be seen in his commentary on Romans vii. 13—25, that the unregenerate sinner not only understands, but strongly approves, the moral law. Of course, by approbation in this connection, he does not mean choice or purpose to obey, but an intellectual conviction that the tendency of that kind of action which the law requires, is to produce perfect happiness, and a consequent approbation, also intellectual, of the law as having that tendency. Witness the following declaration.

"That the law does sustain such a character," i. e. that it is good, "must be well known to the sinner himself. His own reason and conscience take sides with the law, and approve its precepts. Yet still, so *carnally inclined* is he, that he listens not to these, but acts directly against them.—p. 300.

"In the former," i. e. the *inner man*, or reason and conscience, "is still a portion of the image of God, which discerns, and cannot but approve, the holy and perfect law of God that is merely a transcript of his own nature. That the unregenerate have reason and conscience which approve, and must approve, the divine law shows nothing more than that they are *rational* and *moral* beings, with faculties adapted to a state of moral probation; and that they are made in the image of God, so far as rational and moral nature is concerned. This is merely saying that they are *men*, and not brutes. The faculty to discern what is good, the power to approve of it, is in itself no more holy or sinful, than the faculty of ratiocination is, or of seeing or hearing. Nothing can be more unfounded, than the supposition that moral good is put to the account of the sinner, merely, because one assigns to him reason to discover its nature, and conscience to approve it. Without these he could not be a rational and moral being. They are mere *pura naturalia*, to speak in the language of the old theology.—300, 301.

Still farther, Prof. Stuart speaks of the heathen as having a moral sense, by which they may acquire a knowledge of right and wrong. He says,

Those commit a great mistake, then, who deny that men can have any sense of moral duty or obligation, without a knowledge of the scriptures. The apostle's argument, in order to convince the Gentiles of sin, rests on a basis entirely different from this. And if it be alledged, that in this way the necessity of a revelation is superseded; I answer, not at all. The knowledge of some points of moral duty, or the power to acquire such knowledge, is one thing; a disposition to obey the precepts of natural religion, is another. The latter can be affirmed of few indeed, among the heathen of any age or nation. Again; faculties adapted to discover the path of duty, are one thing; the use of them so as effectually to do this, is another. The former the apostle asserts; the latter he denies.—p. 129.

In these statements of Prof. Stuart, no one can fail to recognize the doctrine, that the mind of the sinner is *constitutionally* susceptible of being affected by the truth. We deem these quotations sufficient to show the coincidence between Prof. Stuart's views and our own, on the topic under consideration.

II. The *Nature of Sin*. On this point Prof. Stuart is full and explicit. He recognizes no other sin as possible or conceivable, except the *voluntary transgression of known law*. The following is his language on this subject. "Sin is ἀνομία, i. e. want of con-

formity to law; of course a *voluntary non-conformity* must be meant, the *voluntary non-conformity of an intelligent, rational, moral, free agent*, for no other is capable of sin unless we would maintain that inanimate substances, and brutes, and ideots, and madmen, are sinners." This is said, moreover, in the midst of an argument from scripture to show, that original sin does not consist in "a disposition or inclination that is connate, is antecedent to all choice and volition, and is in itself not only sinful, but the basis and ground of all subsequent sin." This fact sets the theology of Prof. Stuart, on the point in question, beyond a doubt. He holds that there is no sin **BACK OF THE WILL**; none that is not *actual*; no "connate," "innate," or "propagated" depravity; nothing, in short, but what the mind takes cognizance of as "its own act." To hold a moral being accountable for any thing besides that which is his own act, he considers inconsistent with the plainest principles of justice.

On the subject of *infant character*, Prof. Stuart ventures much farther than we have ever done. We have chosen to say merely that whenever moral agency commences, *then* we are to date the commencement of sin. We have not undertaken to decide at what period this takes place, or denied that it may be at the commencement of our being. Prof. Stuart, however, does decide on the subject.

The account of infants in Is. vii. 15, 16; in Jonah iv. 11; and in Deut. i. 39; compared with Rom. iv. 15. 1 John iii. 4. James iv. 17. Luke xii. 47, 48. John ix. 41. xv. 22—24. Rom. i. 20, 21, 32, casts strong light on the explicit declaration of Paul in Rom. ix. 11. For the substance of these declarations of the scriptures, is, that "to him who knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, it is sin;" that where there is no such knowledge, i. e. "where there is no law, there is no transgression;" for "sin is ἀνομία, want of conformity to law; of course a *voluntary non-conformity* must be meant, the *voluntary non-conformity of an intelligent, rational, moral, free agent*; for no other is capable of sin, unless we would maintain that inanimate substances, and brutes, and ideots, and madmen are sinners. Thus one class of texts above cited, teaches. Another class as clearly shows, that our sins bear an exact proportion, in respect to their heinousness, to the degree of light which we have, and the motives to holy obedience by which we are urged; all which of course implies, that if we were in a state in which we had no light, and were incapable of perceiving or feeling the force of any motives, then we should not be sinners. Another class, moreover, develops to us very clearly that infants are incapable of the knowledge in question. Even of the child *Immanuel* is this explicitly asserted; and the assertion is made, moreover, concerning him *after* his birth, Is. vii. 15, 16. The very same thing is explicitly affirmed also by Moses, concerning all the very young children of the Israelites: "Your children, which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil," Deut. i. 39. To the same purpose is the text in Jonah iv. 11. It is the like view of little children, which the Savior presents, when he says to his disciples: "Except ye be converted and *become as little children*, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," Mat. xviii. 3. Again: "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," Mat. xix. 14. Mark x. 13. Luke xviii. 15, 16. So likewise the apostle Paul: "Howbeit, in malice be ye children," 1 Cor. xiv. 20. These comparisons do not imply that little children are positively holy. I know of no declaration in the bible of such import. But they do seem to imply, that they are *innocent*, (*innocuous*;) i. e. that they are not the subjects of positively sinful passions and affections, such as malice, ambition, etc.; for on any other ground, how could they be made the objects of such a

comparison as they here are? * * * ALL MEN PRONOUNCE INFANTS TO BE INNOCENT, UNTIL THEORY BIDS THEM CONTRADICT THIS. pp. 542, 543.

III. *Original sin.* On this subject also, Prof. Stuart's views perfectly coincide with ours. We have affirmed that all of the doctrine that is true and important to be maintained, is the *simple fact* of the connection of human depravity with Adam's sin. This *fact* we have always and strenuously asserted. The Pelagian doctrine that "Adam's sin hurt himself only," is no doctrine of ours. But we have rejected several *theories* respecting the *mode* of that connection, viz. that it is by our being *literally one* with Adam, and sinning in him, that it is by propagation, and that it is by imputation, either literal or figurative. Prof. Stuart also maintains that the bible teaches "the *connection* of Adam's first sin with the sin and consequent condemnation of all his posterity," as "a preparatory or occasional cause." Proceeding to quote Rom. v. 15—19, he adds, "It seems to me to be impossible, without doing violence to the scriptures, to deny that Adam's first offense is here asserted to have a connection with, or an influence upon, the sin and condemnation of all his posterity. *But now, is not said.* Let the reader mark this well. Paul neither asserts that Adam's sin is propagated; nor that it is imputed to us without any act of our own; nor that it is ours merely by the force of example. Nor does he say, that *hereditary* depravity is the ground and cause of all sin, (how could he say this, when Adam sinned without it?) nor that we are condemned without being *actual* sinners. All this has been often said for him, and in his name; but he does not once say this for himself. Why now should we attribute to him our own theories, and then insist on their being a part of scripture?" Here he emphatically denies, just as we do, that the connection of our sin with that of Adam is *by* propagation, or *by* imputation; while, as we have said, the connection itself he fully maintains. Elsewhere, pp. 534—539 he takes up the theories, first of propagation, and then of imputation, and at considerable length, arrays against them difficulties in his view, insurmountable. In respect to the latter theory, there will be found to be a perfect agreement in all important particulars, between his sentiments and those which we formerly advanced in a review of the *Biblical Repertory* on Imputation.

* Those who hold this theory usually maintain, that our depravity is not only *connate* but *innate*, but that being such, it is also the *punishment* of Adam's sin which is imputed to us. There are, however, some very formidable difficulties in the way of this. For, (1) The sin, in this case, of Adam's posterity, i. e. their *original* sin, is, by the very ground of this theory, *merely putative*, not real and actual. But what is the punishment? *Actual*, to be sure, according to the statement of those who advocate this theory; and actual, indeed, in a tremendous degree. The punishment begins with our being; it is connate and innate, and contains within itself not only the commencement of a misery which is naturally without end, but is, at the same time, the root and ground of all other sins which we commit, and which serve unspeakably to augment our condemnation and misery. Now can the human mind well conceive, that perfect justice would punish with actual and everlasting and inevitable corruption and misery, beings who are

sinner only *putatively*, i. e. in mere supposition and not in fact? For myself, I can only say, that all the elements of my moral nature set themselves spontaneously in array against such a representation as this. It is one of those cases, which make it necessary for me to be made over again, and have new and different faculties, before I can admit its truth. Nor,

(2) Can it be brought, in any tolerable measure to accord with the views which the bible gives of divine justice. How can we make it harmonize with the declarations in Ezek. xviii.? Or with many other parts of the bible of the same tenor? But this is not all; for,

(3) The supposition contains a ὕστερον πρότερον within itself. According to the tenor of it, punishment begins *before* the crime. It is coetaneous with the original elements of our being. It begins before distinct perception, and understanding, and reason, and moral sense, are developed. It begins antecedent to all sense of duty, and antecedent to all knowledge of moral rule. Such punishment, therefore, *precedes* transgression, for "where there is no law, there is no transgression;" and surely there is no law, where there is no moral sense, nor reason, nor understanding, nor perception. But how can justice make punishment *precede* transgression? "The soul that sinneth shall die," is the order in which heaven has placed the matter. Sin comes first; punishment is the fruit or consequence. By the theory before us, the reverse is the case. Punishment precedes all personal demerit; and sin follows on as the result of our punishment!

Nor is this at all relieved, by saying that 'sin does precede punishment, in this case, inasmuch as it is Adam's sin for which we are punished;' for this is only affirming that *putative* or *suppositional* guilt, is followed by *real* and *actual* punishment. How does this diminish the difficulty of the case? p. 537.

After this, we think it will not be said that we are any farther upon Pelagian ground than Prof. Stuart, on the point in question. The truth in the case is, that neither of us have taken that ground at all; but that both are *equally* liable to the charge of having done so. Both maintain that great evils came upon mankind in *consequence* of Adam's sin; both deny that the *way in which* they come, is by propagation, or by imputation, either of sin literally, or of any thing else; neither undertake to specify in *what way* those evils *do* come. Prof. Stuart, than whom, few in our country have studied the bible more, says that the bible does not tell; so say we. Now in making a list of teachers who have departed from the truth, on the subject of original sin, how shall we and Prof. Stuart be separated?

IV. *Election*. On this point, Prof. Stuart rejects, as we do, both the Arminian and supralapsarian views, as is manifest from the following paragraphs.

The question seems to be fully settled, by other texts of scripture, viz. that the *merit* or *obedience* of the κλητοί, was not the ground or reason of their regeneration and sanctification. This would be assuming, that holiness existed before it did exist; that it was the *ground* of that, which followed only as a *consequence*.

On the other hand; as to the *decretum absolutum*, as it has been called, viz., the determination that the κλητοί should be saved, irrespectively of their character and actions, one cannot well see how this is to be made out. So much must be true, viz., that they are not regenerated, sanctified, or saved, on account of *merit*; all is of *grace*, pure *grace*. If this be all that any one means by the *decretum absolutum*, there can be no reasonable objection made to it. But on the other hand; as God is *omniscient*, and therefore must know every man's character, through all stages of his being; as all things in their fullest extent, must have always been naked and open to his view; so we cannot once imagine, that any decree or purpose in respect to the κλητοί can have been made *irrespectively* of their *whole* character. Such an *irrespection* (if I may use the word) is impossible.

God has never determined, and from his holy nature never can determine, to save any except such as are *conformed to the image of his Son*. All stands or falls together. A *decretum absolutum*, i. e. a decree which should separate these, or have regard to these, would be a different one from that which the apostle has stated; and I may add, different from what we can even imagine to be possible. pp. 566, 567.

It will be seen by a reference to the preceding article, that our own views accord with these.

The view which Prof. Stuart *does* take of the doctrine of election in general, and which, of course, applies equally to the specific purpose of saving a part, and a part only, of mankind, may be seen in the following paragraph.

Of course, the reasons why God gives to these, and withholds from those, are with himself; they are not grounded on our claims or merits. Reasons he doubtless has, and these of the best kind; for who will venture to tax infinite wisdom and goodness with doing any thing without good and sufficient reason? But then these reasons God has kept to himself; he has not revealed them to us. When this is the case, the apostle speaks of him as acting *κατὰ τὴν πρόθεσιν αὐτοῦ*—*κατὰ τὴν ὀρισμένην βουλὴν καὶ πρόγνωσιν αὐτοῦ*, etc. But nothing can be farther from truth, than to suppose that a Being of infinite wisdom and goodness ever acts *arbitrarily*, or without the best of reasons; although they may be, and often are, unknown to us.—p. 382.

With this we perfectly agree. That the reason why God bestows saving grace as he does, are “known only to himself,” but that they are “wise and good,” we have always maintained. Even in this very statement, however the general reason why he determined to bestow grace as he does, is actually given, viz. that it was *best*, i. e. most for the happiness of the universe, that he should pursue that course in this respect which he does pursue. The farther explanation is not given, viz. *why* it is best, that God should elect this, and not that individual; nor does it comport with reason to suppose that we can know.

Thus we have followed Prof. Stuart through four of the great points on which theologians in our country have differed. On all these points, we may be permitted again to say, there is an entire agreement between us. Will the vials of theological wrath then be poured out on Andover? Will it be said, that the learned professor of sacred literature in that seminary, has entered on an undermining process to destroy the orthodox faith? We trust not in New England. Yet why should the same form and the same substance of doctrine, subject to the imputation of “heretical tendencies,” in one latitude, and escape notice in another?

ERRATA.—In the Memoir of Rev. Sutherland Douglas, p. 567, last line, insert the words “in the vicinity of,” so as to read, he was born *in the vicinity of* Troy, etc.

Page 625, line 14 from the bottom, for “possibility,” read “probability.”

Page 632, in some copies, last line, for “state of,” read “state to.”

